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Executive Summary

In response to concern about the relatively high incidence of violence in NSW correctional centres, the Ministerial Reference Committee on Violence Prevention in the Correctional System (MRC) initiated this project report (Talking up Communication - Talking down Violence: The Corporate Approach to Violence Reduction in the NSW Correctional System).

This report was developed as a joint venture of the Corporate Planning and Development Unit and the Women's Services Unit of the Department of Corrective Services. It is to be used as a basis for the MRC's own report to the Minister for Corrective Services.

Terms of Reference and Methodology

The terms of reference for this report were

- development of a strategic framework to reduce the level and impact of violence in the Department's male and female correctional system

- development of an implementation plan based on innovative effective approaches to reducing violence perpetrated by male and female offenders in both the custodial and non-custodial settings of the Department.

Information gained from a literature search and review guided the formulation of questionnaires used for an extensive consultation process. The recommendations were developed as a result of these consultations with senior Head Office staff, Regional Commanders, Governors, Managers of Programs, correctional centre staff, Probation and Parole staff and Corrections Health Service (CHS). As much as possible, the opinions of offenders were included as well.

In addition, relevant corporate documents, including Inmate Services and Program Plans, were examined with a view to documenting the range of existing departmental strategies with regard to violence reduction and prevention in the correctional system. In developing the recommendations, the project team considered different operational work practices in different work locations.

Scope of the Report

All Australian correctional jurisdictions are required to provide data to the Productivity Commission which co-ordinates the Review of Commonwealth / State Service Provision to ensure ongoing comparisons of the performance of government
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services. As far as data regarding rates of violent incidents is concerned, the Department is required to report on correctional centres only. The Department is required to report on certain indicators for its community corrections as well but they are not related to incidents of violence and aggression.

This is not to say that violence is not also an issue in the supervision of Probation and Parole clients. The different settings require different strategic approaches. Probation and Parole Officers in the community have to work without the safety net of effective backup of the response teams and therefore have to manage risky situations on the strength of their professional skills.

Initiatives in a Custodial Setting

The research for this report clearly shows that the Department's strategic initiatives in terms of violence reduction are based on sound policy and programming principles. This is true in regard to the implementation of offence-specific programs in particular the specialised Violence Prevention Program, the effectiveness with which custodial staff respond to incidents of physical violence, and the quality of documenting incidents as they occur.

The Department has a series of operational and administrative strategies for offenders who use violence instrumentally. They include transfer to the High Risk Management Unit (HRMU) at Goulburn Correctional Centre, the involvement of the High Risk Management Committee and the High Risk Escort Unit or placement at one of the Therapeutic Program Units at the Metropolitan Special Programs Centre (MSPC).

Initiatives in Community Supervision

The Department is leading the implementation of an innovative program with regard to family and domestic violence. The pilot program in Penrith has emerged as the most significant current example of close co-operation between DCS, other departments and external agencies. This program is a joint venture between Penrith Probation and Parole Office, local Police, local Women's Health Centre and Attorney General's Violence Against Women Specialist Unit. What makes the program truly innovative is the fact that it provides a module for perpetrators of domestic and family violence and at the same time it provides a support program for the spousal victims of this violence.

Findings

In comparing rates of incidents of violence between all Australian jurisdictions, NSW correctional centres appear to have a relatively high incidence of violence.
This report acknowledges that there are areas which need improved performance while pointing to the possibility that the present methods comparing incidence of violence across jurisdictions are flawed.

There is a variety of strategic initiatives to reduce the level of violence and aggression particularly in correctional centres. As there is an absence of an overarching corporate violence prevention and reduction policy, the existing initiatives tend to be implemented in an unco-ordinated and non-integrated manner.

The findings can be summarised in the following broad themes:

- improvement in the offender assessment area and specifically the need for a standardised risk assessment tool which provides information as far as the propensity for violence is concerned

- implementation of minimum standards in line with those developed for Junee Correctional Centre with regard to violence prevention and reductions, effective grievance procedures for disputes between inmates and for staff and inmates

- review of the current hierarchy of sanctions and privileges with a view to a more sophisticated system of reward for appropriate behaviour

- clearer delineation of staff roles (eg involvement of case officers and effective structures to foster team approach between custodial, non-custodial, CHS and Probation and Parole staff)

- training/development to provide the necessary skills for staff dealing with challenging behaviours with particular focus on e-learning

- integrated programming and standardisation of programming with focus on violence prevention, violence reduction and anger management

- broadening of the current focus of incident reporting

- review of incident reporting in the Probation and Parole Service and possible inclusion in the Department’s overall statistical data collection

- a recognition that the correctional centre design and environment is often linked with violent and aggressive behaviour

- the structured day with regard to time out of cells and inmate activities as it is currently implemented has a significant impact on access to programs and services for inmates which in turn impacts on incidence of violence and aggression
Recommendations

The report recommends the development of an overarching policy to facilitate an integrated corporate approach to violence prevention and reduction. The underpinning concept of this policy should be based on a conflict resolution model. Such a policy will help to create and/or improve the corporate ambience and culture in which the key elements of a strategic approach to violence reduction can be enhanced and implemented. It will also provide the framework to enhance throughcare initiatives and sustain effective communication between, and cooperation of, all sections of the Department particularly between its two major divisions - custodial services and community supervision services.

Within the parameters of such an overarching policy, the report makes specific recommendations with regard to:

- training, recruitment and professional development
- offender management and the structured day in a correctional centre with a focus on access to programs, services and activities
- program development and evaluation
- staff roles and attitudes
- further research and reporting focus

To give the recommendations practical application and a base from which appropriate program design and evaluation are possible, four pilot projects are suggested:

- the establishment of the position of a community liaison officer at a Probation and Parole District Office
- conflict resolution training for all staff in a designated correctional centre
- a structured violence prevention program for women
- a transitional centre for men
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1 Introduction

In February 1998, the Department established an Inter-Departmental Anti-Violence Committee. It included representatives from the NSW Anti-Discrimination Board, the Attorney General’s Department, the Lesbian and Gay Anti-Violence Project and the NSW Police Service. This committee was formed because of concern about anecdotal evidence regarding the incidence of sexual violence between inmates in correctional centres. The Assistant Commissioner Inmate Management chaired this committee.

In late 2000, the Ministerial Reference Committee on Violence Prevention in the Correctional System (MRC) replaced the Inter-Departmental Anti-Violence Committee. The MRC comprises members from the Victims of Crime Bureau (Attorney General’s Department), Aboriginal Justice Advisory Council (AJAC), NSW Police Service, NSW Law Society, Department of Health, Workcover and NSW Anti-Discrimination Board. The MRC has a broader focus than the first Committee and concentrates on violence and aggression in the correctional system across the board. The Senior Assistant Commissioner Inmate and Custodial Services (SACICS) chairs the MRC.

The terms of reference for the MRC included

- a review of the strategies and recommendations of the preceding Inter-Departmental Anti-Violence Committee and the Department’s current violence prevention strategies

- articulation of an appropriate evaluation framework of violence prevention strategies

- the development of a report and a proposed contingency plan for the implementation of strategies and programs aimed at preventing violence in the correctional system to the Minister for Corrective Services

This project report (Talking up Communication - Talking Down Violence : The Corporate Approach to Violence Reduction in the NSW Correctional System) was initiated by the MRC to be used as the basis for its own report to the Minister for Corrective Services. The original project proposal1 was developed as a joint venture between the Department’s Corporate Planning and Development Unit and the Women’s Services Unit. It was subsequently approved by the MRC and endorsed by SACICS. It defined its objectives as:

---

1 See appendix 1: Project Proposal
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• development of a strategic framework to reduce the level and impact of violence in the Department's male and female correctional system

• development of an implementation plan based on innovative effective approaches to reducing violence perpetrated by male and female offenders in both the custodial and non-custodial settings of the Department.

A small steering committee was formed drawing on the expertise of custodial, non-custodial and Probation and Parole staff. This committee met twice and provided comment on the progress of the project.

Though the scope of the project was always known to be extensive, unexpected challenges still arose. It proved difficult, for example, to develop relevant and useful recommendations when the day-to-day realities of the management of offenders occurs in institutions which by their physical layout alone, may not be conducive to the implementation of contemporary corrective services theories and practices.

The relationship between Departmental staff and offenders under their supervision is crucial in any development of effective violence prevention and violence reduction strategies. The project team has had to review work practices in several sections of the Department which at first glance did not immediately seem to be related to the topic at hand. Under closer scrutiny, however, those work practices were clearly connected to the level of frustration which might be experienced by some people under the supervision and care of the Department. In developing its recommendations, the project team was conscious of the fact that operational work practices have to be seen in the context of the Department’s legal responsibilities and considerations of public security which must not be jeopardised under any circumstances. The project team also acknowledges that these work practices cannot be critiqued in the same way as a working relationship between service providers and customers or clients in normal social and economic circumstances.

To do justice to the broad topic of the project, the methodology for the research for this report included extensive consultations conducted over several months, involving staff from all sections of the Department and staff from Corrections Health Service (CHS). The views of inmates were considered to be crucial also because their perspective is necessary to develop and implement effective new strategies and procedures to reduce violence in the correctional system.

In the course of a project of this length, it is inevitable that the situation at different work locations may undergo significant changes. For example, since the consultations and observations for this report have been completed, Seven Wing at
the Malabar Special Programs Centre (MSPC) no longer houses remand inmates. Seven Wing has been closed and was re-opened as an assessment unit for the specialised sex offender program Area 3 at the MSPC. There are still lessons to be learnt specifically as they relate to the importance of the physical environment, access to meaningful activities, employment and to inmate services and programs because they influence the behaviour of inmates and are therefore crucial to any analysis about frustration, violence and aggression.

The questionnaires used in the consultations are recorded in appendix 2. Copies of an annotated bibliography are available from the Corporate Planning Unit or the Women's Services Unit.

See Section 5.4 for details on Seven Wing.
2 Project Methodology

To achieve the two broad project objectives, that is

- the development of a strategic framework for violence reduction, and
- the development of an implementation plan,

the following steps were undertaken in accordance with the project proposal:

• Identify and define the current nature, incidence and prevalence of violence in the correctional system for both men and women.

All available statistical data concerning the incidence of violence in the correctional system was analysed. This included highlighting issues relating to the collection of data and the Department's relevant information systems and issues relating to the Department's reporting obligations to the Productivity Commission with regard to the national correctional indicators.

• Review existing models of violence prevention with a view to identifying effective gender-specific program blueprints.

A comprehensive literature search was conducted and the opinions of Departmental staff (including those in other Australian jurisdictions) with expertise in the area of violence prevention and reduction were sought. The opinions of inmates and of a small number of offenders under Probation and Parole supervision were also obtained. The input of the Statewide Clinical Coordinator of the Violence Prevention Program was particularly pertinent for this report.

• Collate and document all Departmental violence reduction programs and projects with a view to improving information exchange across the Department.

In consultations with staff across the Department and in reviewing selected Departmental documents, a significant number of corporate and correctional centre based initiatives were identified. The list cannot be exhaustive as changes are made regularly.

• Canvass national and international research and literature to identify best practice program models of violence prevention.
In reviewing a considerable part of the literature dealing with violence and related issues, the project team collated an annotated bibliography.

- Consult widely across all sections of the Department and Corrections Health Service (CHS).

Wide-ranging consultations and formal interviews (using questionnaires) were conducted with senior Head Office staff, Regional Commanders, Governors, Managers of Programs, correctional centre staff, Probation and Parole staff, Corrections Health Service (CHS) and offenders. 3

- Identify the relationships between CHS and DCS and external agencies in devising anti-violence strategies.

Apart from seeking the opinions and advice from CHS staff, documents relating to the Department’s Community Grants Program were reviewed with regard to the service standards which are part of funding contracts and which include references to “minimising the risk of violent incidents”.

- Identify the human and material resources necessary to implement anti-violence strategies.

For their effective implementation, all program interventions with regard to violence need qualified, trained and experienced custodial and non-custodial staff. In identifying the necessary human resources, the project focused on the aspects of training and staff development.

There is a direct causal link between expressions of anger, frustration and violence and the physical conditions and environment staff and inmates must work and live in. Specific work places (several individual correctional centre areas and individual Probation and Parole offices) were the subject of particular scrutiny.

- Make recommendations with regard to an appropriate evaluation framework of violence prevention strategies with appropriate standards and performance indicators.

At the conclusion of the consultation process and the review of the Department’s violence reduction strategies and the associated research, the project officers convened a focus group comprising staff from a cross-section of the Department.

---

3 See appendix 2: Questionnaires and appendix 3: Consultations
The suggestions of this group were incorporated in the final recommendations of this report.

2.1 Literature Review

At the commencement of this project, a thorough literature search was conducted. Areas covered included:

- gender and violence
- violence between inmates of correctional institutions
- occupational violence
- Aboriginal men and women and violence
- violence reduction programs
- family and domestic violence
- alcohol and other drugs and violence
- mental health issues and violence
- intellectual disability and violence
- protection and short term management
- sex offenders
- staff attitudes and violence against staff
- violence response teams
- environments and violence

The information gained from the literature search and review guided the formulation of the questionnaires for the consultation process and highlighted areas of importance pertinent to this report. An annotated bibliography was developed by the project team.4

A specific objective was described in the initial project proposal to “Review existing models of violence prevention with a view to identifying effective gender-specific program blueprints”. Despite the comprehensive literature search, a holistic violence prevention model which details effective gender-specific program intervention for female perpetrators of violence and aggression could not be identified. However, in consultation with staff at correctional centres for women and the Statewide Clinical Co-ordinator, Violence Prevention Programs, specific issues of concern in developing violence prevention models for women have been identified.5 Of

---

4 The annotated bibliography is available as a separate document.

5 At the time of this report, plans were underway to implement a violence prevention/reduction program for female offenders at the Berrima Correctional Centre in cooperation between the Long Bay Violence Prevention Program, the Governor of Mulawa Correctional Centre and the Women's Services Unit.
assistance in this regard are the first two stages\(^6\) of a study into the criminogenic needs of female offenders provided by the HM Prison Service.

Other results of the literature review appear throughout this report.

### 2.2 Consultations

For this report, staff from across the Department and Corrections Health Service (CHS) were consulted. As much as possible, the opinions of offenders were included as well.

Formal interviews using questionnaires\(^7\) were conducted with two (2) Regional Commanders, twenty (20) Governors, eighteen (18) Managers of Programs, thirty-nine (39) Correctional Officers, twenty-eight (28) Probation and Parole Officers, ten (10) Nurse Unit Managers, fifty-six (56) inmates and two (2) offenders under community supervision and the Director Inmate Services and Programs.

"One of the most effective violence reduction strategies is dynamic security where emphasis is on communication and team work, and where inmates feel their concerns are heard in an empathic way within a social climate in which they have rights and responsibilities."

Tim Keogh, Director Inmate Services and Programs

The project officers also sought the opinions of senior Departmental staff including the Assistant Commissioner Probation and Parole and the Assistant Commissioner Inmate Management.\(^8\)

### 2.3 Sample Groups

As almost all Governors, Managers of Programs and Nurse Unit Managers were consulted, a summary of their views on the project subject is clearly representative. The same cannot be assumed when it comes to the collective view of Correctional Officers, Probation and Parole Officers and offenders. While the numbers formally interviewed were significant overall, they are only a sample of particular professional

---

\(^6\) The first two stages comprise "A Retrospective Study of Criminogenic Factors in the Female Prison Population" and a literature review which at the time of this report was not yet published: HM Prison Service, 2000.

\(^7\) See appendix 2: Questionnaires

\(^8\) See appendix 3: Consultations
groups for particular correctional centres and particular Probation and Parole offices.

They provide, however, vital clues as far as the reasons and triggers for violent and aggressive behaviour and effective management strategies are concerned. They also provide compelling insights into the physical conditions and daily activities and procedures which can either create an environment which is conducive to productive and effective rehabilitative program intervention or which can create an atmosphere in which aggression and violence will thrive.
3 Background

3.1 National Correctional Indicators

Since 1993, all correctional jurisdictions in Australia are required to provide data with regard to different aspects of their administrative and operational practices to the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Provision which is co-ordinated by the Productivity Commission.

This Review has two stated functions

- to provide ongoing comparisons of the performance of government services, and
- to report on service provision reforms that governments have implemented or are under consideration.

All submitted data is measured against stated performance indicators which comprise:

- unnatural deaths
- escapes/absconds
- out-of-cell hours
- imprisonment rate
- community corrections offender rate
- employment/work
- education
- total cost of service
- cost per prisoner/offender
- offender-to-staff ratio
- prison utilisation

"An area that continues to be of concern is the high number of minor assaults recorded, as compared to other States. The Department will review this situation ... as it is apparent these figures are not counted in the same way as other jurisdictions."

Leo Keliher, Commissioner, Annual Report 2000/2001

Each jurisdiction reports also on the following categories but the information in these tends to be either incomplete or not strictly comparable between all the States and Territories:

- assaults
- completion of community orders
- personal development
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- cost per prisoner/offender (in terms of Government operations resource management)
- assaults per prisoner in publicly owned facilities

There are five further indicators. They are listed as either “yet to be developed” or “not collected for the purpose of the report”. They are to determine, for example, offence related programs, number of reports recorded, cost per inmate movement, cost per report, and offender-to-staff ratios.

Comparing Data Across Jurisdictions

Since the introduction of the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Provision, difficulties with comparisons of data across jurisdictions have emerged. They pertain specifically to the collection of data concerning assaults inside correctional centres. Serious and less serious assaults were combined into one indicator. Under this counting system which existed until February 2001, the NSW Department of Corrective Services had a high rate of assaults compared with all other correctional jurisdictions in Australia.

"It is important to recognise that a violent event is never simple, nor simply reducible to the violent propensities of given individuals. Many academic disciplines make this mistake by seeing violence in terms of the characteristics of individuals."

Shaw, 2000

Since February 2001, assault/fight data are categorised according to seriousness of injury (known as serious assault, assault and other assault). As a result, the NSW figures for serious assaults are now comparable with those of the other reporting States and Territories. The NSW figures for less serious assaults still exceed those of the other reporting jurisdictions. One explanation for this discrepancy might be that whilst the counting rules for serious assaults are quite specific, the counting rules for non-serious assaults are less so and are therefore more likely to result in wider variations across jurisdictions and not necessarily reflect the actual rate of assaults.

10 Serious assaults for NSW were reported as 0.9 per 100 prisoners, Victoria (1.1), South Australia (0.3), Tasmania (0.8) and the Northern Territory (0.8). Queensland, Western Australia and the ACT did not report serious assaults for 2000/01. (Source: Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Provision 2002)

11 Assaults for NSW were reported as 22.5 per 100 prisoners, Victoria (8.3), South Australia (0.9), Tasmania (7.6) and the Northern Territory (10.0). Queensland, Western Australia and the ACT did not report assaults for 2000/01. (Source: Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Provision 2002)
3.2 Defining Violence

Defining violence in the context of corrective services is complicated by the lack of real knowledge about the extent of the problem in correctional centres and in community corrections. The reporting of violent incidents is not conclusive due to the wide variation in the understanding of what is violent and how violent something has to be before it is worth reporting.

To be effective, definitions of violence must focus on the victim's perceptions of the violence and on the context in which the violence takes place, as much as on the violent action itself. For example, a violent incident that occurs during a match on a football field may be interpreted quite differently if it were to take place on the street.

Definitions of violence usually encompass physical assault and sexual assault. They often cover threats, intimidation, stalking, sexual harassment, psychological and emotional abuse and social and financial abuse. Government Departments such as Police, Health and Community Services pay specific attention to domestic violence, violence against children and sexual violence.

Violence within the context of correctional services is rarely defined in specific and formal terms. In the Operations Procedures Manual and in the guidelines concerning reporting requirements, the emphasis is on procedural matters and a "serious incident" is defined as an

"event ...which significantly affects the operations or routine of a correctional centre or other custodial area; disrupts or threatens to disrupt the good order and discipline of any correctional centre; harms or threatens to harm the personal safety of any individual within a correctional centre ...; has the potential to embarrass the Department or to attract media attention." 12

The following overall definition has been provided in the Draft Statement on Violence in the New South Wales Correctional System13:

"Violence is unwarranted behaviour which can inflict bodily harm, endanger life and produce long-term effects for victims. Aggressive behaviour is verbal or physical behaviour which conveys a threat of violent consequences if the aggressor's wishes are not met."

12 NSW Department of Corrective Services, Operations Procedures Manual, Annexure 13.9
13 Kevin O'Sullivan, 1999
This definition could be further broadened to correspond to the one proposed by the UK National Association of Probation Officers:\textsuperscript{14}

\textit{Physical or verbal behaviours which are threatening, intended to be threatening or are perceived to be threatening. Violent behaviours may present in a number of different ways and may have differing outcomes.}

Within the stated aims and objectives for this report, a definition of violence should be understood to include violence by offenders in the community, violence between offenders in custody, between inmates and custodial officers and clients and Probation and Parole staff, and violence between staff members. It encompasses racial abuse, sexual aggression and harassment, threats and verbal abuse as well as physical violence.

In defining violence as such, it must be recognised that all individuals experience the behaviour of others differently. What one person may perceive as violent or threatening, another may not. Illustrating this point are the perceptions of inmates interviewed for this project whose opinions of what constitutes violence varied widely. Their views ranged from “anything that impinges on another inmate’s liberty or rights” to “stabblings, bashings, burning cells”. Likewise staff members’ perceptions of violence varied, with many staff underplaying the levels of violence and aggression that they were exposed to, often brushing it off as being “part of the job”.

3.2.1 Anger and Violence

Anger, sometimes mistakenly used synonymously with violence, also requires clear definition. Anger occurs on a continuum from mild annoyance to rage or fury and can have many positive functions. Anger becomes problematic when an individual has poor control over or poor methods of expressing anger. Anger is linked closely to reactive violence - violent behaviour which occurs as a result of anger or rage (such as an assault during an argument). Because of this link, anger is often targeted as a variable to change when rehabilitating offenders. Since violent behaviour is of concern within institutions, anger represents both a management and a treatment consideration.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{14} Littlechild, B., 1997
\textsuperscript{15} Suter and Byrne, 2000
Violence can take place without the presence of anger. Instrumental violence occurs when violent behaviour is used as a means to an end (e.g., armed robbery to obtain money). There is a clear need for different programming responses to address the different types of violent behaviour. For example, anger management courses are unlikely to have an impact on an offender who makes use of violence instrumentally.

3.2.2 Environment and Violence

Within the literature canvassed for this report, there is significant evidence linking the correctional centre environment with violent and aggressive behaviour. Aspects of the environment that have been noted as contributors to increased rates of violence include the physical design and layout of correctional centres, officer supervision, and management styles which support over-reliance on male sex-role stereotypes.  

In 1999, a report by the Chief Inspector of Prisons in the United Kingdom used the term “healthy prisons” to stress the importance of the “total prison environment in amplifying or mitigating suicidal feelings in those who are at risk”. This report provided a model for a “healthy prison” which, although designed as a suicide prevention measure, also provides a framework for anti-violence strategies. It included four ‘tests’ by which the ‘health’ of a correctional centre can be gauged.

"My first thought is that serious enforcement of custody rules and regulations keeps inmates straight. To my surprise, the evidence does not support this hypothesis. ... I found that those who reported the fewest restrictions also had the fewest disciplinary problems.”

Stevens, 1997

The first test (“that the weakest prisoner feels safe”) includes the creation of a safe environment, regular monitoring of inmates and effective anti-bullying strategies.

The second test (“prisoners are treated with respect as individuals”) is to ensure that inmates have an understanding of how they can access services and maintain their family links; inmates must also have an understanding, for example, of the role of Governors and senior managers as monitors of staff conduct.

---

16 Examples: Zupan 1991 and Zupan and Stohr Gilmore 1998 as cited by Tartaro, 2001; Stevens, 1997; Lutze and Murphy, 1999

17 HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (UK), 1999
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The third test ("prisoners are fully and purposefully occupied and are expected to improve themselves") stresses the need to ensure that inmates engage in constructive activities each day. It determines that a choice of activities should be available including basic literacy and numeracy programs and opportunities for self expression.

The fourth test ("prisoners can strengthen links with their families and prepare themselves for release") includes programs that prevent re-offending and "resettlement programs" to prepare all inmates for release. It also stipulates that community agencies must be involved where necessary to provide support services after release from custody.

"For men, aggression is a 'means of exerting control over other people when they feel the need to reclaim power or self-esteem', but for women it is 'temporary loss of control caused by overwhelming pressure and resulting in guilt'.”

Shaw, 2000

In the practice of corrective services in New South Wales, there is a commitment to all of the indicators listed in the 'tests' for the UK Chief Inspector's report. The elements forming the basis for a "healthy prison" are present in various policy and procedural documents and underpin the Department's throughcare initiatives. They are not yet articulated in a stand-alone document.

3.3 Gender Considerations

One of the strongest predictors of violence and criminal involvement is gender. Despite the "maleness" of crime, criminological research to date has either neglected issues of gender, or has used samples involving men only.18

Most criminological studies presented as universal are in fact pertinent to men only. At the same time, when the issue of gender is specifically discussed, the focus tends to be on women exclusively; when generic terms such as people or offenders are used, they generally are intended to read 'men'. The following perspective seems to be the most useful:

"Men and Boys perpetrate more conventional crimes and the more serious of these crimes than women and girls. Sex difference explains more variance in crime"

18 Burton, Cullen, Evans, Fiftal Alarid and Dunaway, 1998
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Women commit fewer crimes of all types and proportionately fewer serious and violent crimes than men do.19

Since the study of criminology has been mainly the study of men, some feminist criminologists make the incorrect assumption that criminality of men has been adequately and conclusively explained.20 There is also a suggestion that a "capacity to explain the high sex ratio and sexed character of many criminal practices might be posed as a litmus test for the viability of the discipline."21 This "litmus test" seems to be one which "criminology has failed quite spectacularly to pass."22

"Men's criminality can be discussed in terms of their class, their race, their age, their religion, education, occupation, or marital status; but the role of their membership of a sex is never investigated as it is for women" Allen, 1988

This report seeks to recognise the 'gendered' nature of violence and thus examines all available information with this in mind. References to 'inmates' and 'offenders' are used only when gender-neutral terms are appropriate and deliberately intended.

3.4 Ethnicity, Racism and Violence

As there is a disproportionately high number of Aboriginal men and women in the criminal justice system and as Aboriginal male offenders are also over-represented on the "Extreme/High Security Inmates' List"23, it is obvious that issues of race and ethnicity must be considered in devising appropriate violence reduction strategies.

The literature review for this report established that there is a mounting body of research conducted in Australia which is challenging the assumption that the violent behaviour of Aboriginal people can be characterised and addressed in the same manner as that of non-Aboriginal people. At the same time there is a dearth of relevant literature on the existence of links between ethnicity, race and violence.

20 Allen, 1989
21 Ibid p 19
22 Collier, 1998, p 2
23 The inmates on this list are monitored by the High Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of the Serious Offenders Review Council (SORC)
Given the time frame and resources, this project could not pursue this topic beyond its barest rudiments. It is important to note however, that the findings of this report dovetail with the recommendations in *Gangs in the New South Wales Correctional System: Clarifying the Assertion* 24 in which considerations of ethnicity and race are given particular attention.

There is little doubt that racism exists in New South Wales correctional centres in the same way that racism exists in the wider community. The consultations for this report demonstrated that inmates experience racism and that this can be a cause for some of the violence inside gaols. Again, this report can but highlight this issue as an area for further attention and research.

### 3.5 Current Departmental Strategies - Violence Reduction and Prevention

The corporate parameters for violence prevention and violence reduction are defined in broad terms in the Department’s Guarantee of Service as articulated in the Corporate Plan 2001-2004:

> "The Department guarantees to adequately meet the security, safety and welfare needs of correctional centre inmates..."

In addition, the Procedures Manual 25 specifically states that the “Department, as custodian of inmates and an employer of staff, owes a duty of care to prevent injury to inmates and staff arising, amongst other things, from self-harm, assaults...”

As it stands, this explicit commitment to security and safety is aimed specifically at “correctional centre inmates” and not to offenders under supervision by the Department at large.

---

24 Goodstone, 2001

25 NSW Department of Corrective Services, *Operations Procedures Manual; Section 8*
In addressing the program needs of offenders, the Corporate Plan, however, is all inclusive; it stipulates that it will “provide opportunity, encouragement and program pathways for offenders under supervision in the community and inmates of correctional centres to enable them to acquire skills, address deficits and assume responsibility for living constructive law-abiding lives”.

This confirms and reinforces the dual approach to violence reduction and prevention adopted by the Department:

- development of strategies to ensure the safe and humane containment of inmates and
- provision of program interventions which support offenders to prevent relapse and to develop appropriate social and effective communication skills.

There are numerous policies and operational procedures across the Department which are specifically designed to reduce violence and aggression or which, although not exclusively focused on violence reduction, contribute to violence prevention. Some of these initiatives are specific to individual correctional centres and some have Department-wide implications.

The corporate approach to violence reduction and prevention, however fragmented, does recognise the different origins of violence. Departmental strategies addressing violence either focus on operational procedures and practices which are to respond to violent and aggressive behaviour in a custodial and community supervision environment or they focus on specific program interventions which are to meet the criminogenic needs of offenders.

3.5.1 Operational Strategies and Program Interventions

Operational and administrative strategies tend to focus on the “good order” of the gaol, the safety of the community in general and the safety of staff and inmates in particular. These strategies focus on placement options and appropriate access to programs, services and Corrective Services Industries (CSI) employment.

For inmates who use violence strategically or instrumentally, strategies include transfer to the High Risk Management Unit (HRMU) at Goulburn Correctional

---

26 This is the contemporary term used by practitioners to determine ‘risks’ which relate to the likelihood of re-offending and to ascertain ‘needs’ which relate to any issues in a person’s life which might contribute to criminal actions.
Centre, the involvement of the High Risk Management Committee and the High Risk Escort Unit or placement at one of the Therapeutic Program Units at the MSPC.

Case Management

In addition to these strategies with a stated objective of violence reduction, there are other activities with a major emphasis on communication within a case management framework which might help to curtail violence although that might not be their primary objective.

"Corporate violence reduction strategies are only effective if they are realistic, if they match the environment they are designed for, if they are gender specific, and if they are backed by the most senior management and resourced adequately."
Deborah Alien, Director, Strategy and Policy

There are current initiatives as part of the Throughcare Strategic Framework 27 which are to improve the Department’s offender assessment processes with regard to the “risk of re-offending” but which still do not include identification of “risk of violence”.

These initiatives are also designed to contribute to the effective information exchange across all sections of the Department and between the Department and CHS in particular so that factors which might contribute to an offender’s unacceptable behaviour can be taken into consideration.

Cognitive Skills Based Program Provision

Program interventions are to respond to offenders’ criminogenic needs and their history of violence. Specific program modules provided for male offenders who have been assessed as being of extreme and high risk of danger to others are in place or are currently being implemented. For example, Departmental strategies to respond to reactive violence include the Violence Prevention Program (VPP) and associated satellite programs, anger management programs, domestic violence and family violence programs, and access to activities (including work, education and leisure).28

---

27 Draft Throughcare Strategic Framework, New South Wales Department of Corrective Services, February 2002

28 See appendix 4: List of Specific Strategic Violence Reduction Initiatives
In step with contemporary correctional practices, the Department's program interventions are implemented within a cognitive skills framework which encompasses harm minimisation and relapse prevention. There are programs for offenders provided by individual Inmate Services and Program disciplines and Probation and Parole offices which deal with issues of violence as well address a range of identified criminogenic needs.

"There is indeed a lot of fragmentation in the implementation of violence prevention programs which is a double edged sword - it's positive because it shows initiative and it's negative because there are many untested programs around as well.... some of these are not assessment based."

Hans Ellfeldt, State-wide Clinical Co-ordinator, Violence

In light of the number of male inmates who would benefit from the structured residential Violence Prevention Program currently operating in two stages at Long Bay, the number of available program spaces is insufficient.

3.5.2 Fast and Professional Response

There is no doubt that the Department takes incidents of violence in correctional centres seriously and is constantly examining its performance in this area. During the consultations and observations for this report, it became apparent that there are many Departmental strategies in place which are effective in curtailing violence in correctional centres. For example, custodial officers respond with great speed and professional skills to any violent and disruptive behaviour on the part of inmates.

There is also no doubt that Departmental staff are competent in documenting the details of what occurred during and after an incident in a correctional centre. The information obtained through the established reporting mechanisms is valuable when reviewing local practices with regard to violence prevention.

The Department is currently in the process of implementing the recommendations to address violence and aggression in relation to the existence of inmate groupings (alternately known as security threat groups or "gangs").

29 See appendix 5: Serious Incident Checklist
30 Goodstone, 2001
3.5.3 Interdepartmental Approaches and Community Co-operation

The Department is leading the implementation of an innovative program with regard to family and domestic violence. The pilot program in Penrith has emerged as the most significant current example of close co-operation between DCS, other Departments and external agencies. This program is a joint venture between Penrith Probation and Parole Office, local Police, local Women's Health Centre and Attorney General's Violence Against Women Specialist Unit. What makes the program truly innovative is the fact that it provides a module for male perpetrators of domestic and family violence and at the same time it provides a support program for the spousal victims of this violence. It is also planned to implement a program specifically designed to meet the emotional needs of the children of the perpetrators.

"Teachers may need to apply different strategies in different correctional centres; for example, violence in Goulburn is very out in the open and people work and live under siege. There the lines are clearly delineated; the lines may be much more blurred in a minimum security centre where different levels of behaviour are expected. In turn, this brings other pressures for staff with it. Teachers are part of a continuum in which they might be required to show great empathy with inmates and in which they might also have to enforce the 'correctional line'. Everybody works in this continuum but nobody talks about it."

Mark Adams, Deputy Principal, AEVTI

He referred specifically to teachers but his observations are true for all staff working in correctional centres.

Another example of community co-operation was mentioned by staff consulted for this report. They pointed to specific visiting schemes particularly for Aboriginal inmates as likely contributors to violence reduction. Some of these involve the Department's collaboration with Aboriginal community organisations and again, although not designed particularly as violence reduction strategies, they have a positive effect in this regard.

3.5.4 Staff Role and Identified Risk

There is no doubt that the work of staff employed in the custodial and community supervision sections of the Department is complex and requires a high level of professionalism to deal with the challenges inherent in the correctional system.
Working in a Custodial Environment

By definition, people under the supervision and care of the Department can be dangerous and volatile; they can also be demanding because of their specific needs in relation to their mental health status and alcohol and other drug related problems.

Staff working in a custodial environment, particularly in reception and remand centres must function in stressful situations within a relatively confined space.

Different Challenges in a Community Setting

Probation and Parole Officers in the community work without the safety net of effective backup of the response teams and often manage risky situations on the strength of their professional skills alone.

In 1999, a risk assessment report on the role of Probation and Parole staff was completed. Its aim was to

"... identify the significant health and injury risks related to Probation and Parole employees' interaction with clients during normal and after hours and during office and home visit environments [sic]". 31

A series of "recommended controls for those risks" were developed to be implemented through an Action Plan.

A similar assessment has not been carried out for staff working in correctional centres.

31 Jeffery, R., 1999
Recruiting for Communication Skills

During the observations for this report, the project team experienced first hand how the personality of a Correctional Officer or a Probation and Parole Officer can either exacerbate or diffuse a potentially difficult situation. Communication skills in this context are crucial and there seems to be an assumption that these skills are naturally present in women. Many Governors consulted for this report argued strongly for an increase in the number of female officers in their ranks. They believed that women officers bring effective strategic communication skills with them and so influence the overall ambience of a correctional centre. Almost without exception the Governors said that women officers generally have a positive influence over the behaviour of inmates.

"A more balanced staffing mix could help if the right staff were selected. I would rather have good men than bad women. It's about individuals' skills rather than what they are. Sometimes I think an officer's 'minority status' can put them under a lot of pressure because of all the extra expectations."
Lee Downes, Governor, Mulawa CC

It is important to remember that when Governors argue for an increase in the number of female custodial staff, they are not proposing a gender imbalance in favour of women. Currently, only approximately 15 percent of the custodial officers are women.

A cursory look at the Department’s recruitment strategies shows that the visual images intended to attract new staff concentrate almost exclusively on the physical security aspects of a custodial officer’s work. A ‘message’ about the role of a modern Correctional Officer with regard to communication skills is not prominent in the advertising material. It could be argued that this may deter rather than draw in applications from women.

There needs to be recognition that the communication skills deemed most appropriate in the contemporary offender management practices, are not female skills per se. Male applicants who have the relevant communication skills can have the same positive influence on the behaviour of offenders.

3.6 Occupational Violence

Although this report did not set out to look specifically at issues with regard to staff relationships, it is clear that there are incidents of bullying and harassment in the workplace. The MRC was provided with a briefing paper concerning occupational
violence linking Departmental initiatives in this area with the research project carried out by the Australian Institute of Criminology.\(^{32}\)

The Department is currently developing a range of processes which deal with occupational violence. For example, the Executive Director Human Resources delivered a series of workshops designed to raise staff awareness about bullying and harassment in the workplace and of the Department's new corporate policy\(^ {33}\) which deals with the early identification of any issues in this area, resolution processes and training components.

An Employee Health and Safety Unit with a brief to cover all issues relating to employee relationships was established in 2001 and is operating from the Corrective Services Academy.

### 3.7 Violence Reduction Strategies in Other Jurisdictions

All Australian corrective services jurisdictions use a cognitive skills based framework derived from the 'What-Works' literature in providing programs to address issues of violence. They all emphasise the need for improved screening and assessment processes. All jurisdictions use a case management model. In the smaller jurisdictions such as Tasmania, operational strategies to prevent and reduce violence in a correctional centre might be limited because there might be no alternative placement options, for example.

The sections below are but a brief summary of the main anti-violence strategies in a custodial setting in most Australian States and do not purport to paint the whole picture.

#### 3.7.1 Victoria

The Victorian correctional system does not have an overarching policy with regard to violence and violence prevention in custody, although there is a review underway of all violence prevention practices, including the development of policies and programs to address violent offending behaviour. Based on the UK "healthy prisons" concept, this is to include community-based prevention programs.

\(^{32}\) Mayhew, C., 2000a and Mayhew, C., 2000b

\(^{33}\) The policy "Managing Bullying and Harassment" was circulated for comment in January 2002
Furthermore, the “Enhanced Thinking Skills” program based on the work of James McGuire has been trialed and evaluated by CORE, the public arm of correctional administration in Victoria.

3.7.2 Queensland

Staff at the Queensland Corrective Services Policy Directorate acknowledge that violence reduction strategies are an underdeveloped section in program design and provision. An integrated strategic corporate approach is yet to be achieved.

There is an intensive intervention program for male offenders with histories of extreme violence. The program is of eight months duration and is ‘packaged’ in seven discrete modules within a cognitive skills and relapse prevention framework. This program has been offered at the Woodford Correctional Centre for the last three years and at the Sir David Longland Correctional Centre for the last 12 months. At the time of this report, the Queensland Department of Corrective Services was in the process of selecting an external consultant to evaluate this program.

Operationally, Queensland Corrections make use of both protection and segregation, but without the different categories of protection familiar to NSW. The most common violence prevention measure is to change the dynamics of particular groups in living units by placing inmates in different wings.

3.7.3 South Australia

The Department for Correctional Services in South Australia developed a range of core programs available to offenders across a range of locations both in institutions and in the community. They are offence focused, delivered in response to assessed need and monitored to meet quality standards. Anger management and domestic violence are two of the key areas.

"We take away their opportunity to be violent, but in doing so, we take away their opportunity to be anything else"

Eva Les, Director, Custodial Services, Department for Correctional Services, SA.

As with all other States, the South Australian Department of Correctional Services has no overarching policy regarding violence prevention. In South Australia there is a recognition that violence cannot be seen only as the result of an individual’s pathology, but also as a result of the environment and other factors not necessarily under the control of the individual.
Through working with a few particularly violent inmates, the South Australian Department has found that the use of segregation for example, can be related to subsequent violence. An inmate leaving a period of sensory deprivation in segregation may become unable to cope with expectations of normal behaviour and lead to panic and an increased need to exert ‘control’ over their environment.

3.7.4 Tasmania

The Tasmanian Correctional System does not have an overarching policy regarding the prevention or reduction of violence, nor has it implemented an anti-bullying strategy. The response to incidents of violence take the form of internal discipline processes akin to those in other States. Since the majority of inmates are located in Risdon Prison, the administrators make use of yards to separate and manage the male inmates.

Some of the programs provided to inmates in Tasmania include modules dealing with conflict resolution but there is no specialised residential violence prevention program.
4 Statistical Data

4.1 Reporting and Recording of Incidents

The Research and Statistics Unit of the Department collate data on incidents of violence from three sources:

- Assault Reports - a report by an institution to the Duty Officer regarding an incident;
- Running Sheets - a brief summary of events reported to the Duty Officer as they occur;
- Misconduct Charges - misconduct charges heard by Governors extracted from the Offender Management System database.

For the purpose of the Department’s reporting obligations to the Productivity Commission, incidents of assaults by inmates against inmates are categorised as either “serious” (resulting in overnight hospitalisation, x-rays and/or stitches) or “non-serious” (physical injury present but not requiring significant medical intervention).

A third category of “other” (an assault resulting in no physical injury) is also provided to the Productivity Commission but is not used in the Commission’s reports.

"There is a doubling up of forms and information; there are questions about what constitutes 'ordinary' and 'out of the ordinary' which determines whether something gets reported. The assault forms are based only on 'physical and/or sexual assault' ."

Sue Wye, Governor, Bathurst CC

Further to the data prepared for the Productivity Commission, the Department interprets statistics regarding assaults in more detail for a variety of purposes. In the case of assaults by inmates against inmates, additional categories include “no injury”, “hospital”, “fatality” and “sexual”. In addition, the Department records data on assaults against officers, fights between inmates, assaults and fights in periodic detention centres, deaths in custody, incidents of self-harm and offences in custody.

34 Unless otherwise stated, the data noted in this report have been provided by the Research and Statistics Unit of the Department. The Project Team have particularly drawn on information provided in Assaults and Fights in NSW Correctional Centres 2000 by Simon Corben of the Research and Statistics Unit.
As an overall observation, it is important to note that the Department's reporting requirements and processes are very well understood and followed by Departmental staff.

4.2 Incidence of Violence

In the range of statistics counted by the Department there are those which are closely related to the incidence of violence within the system (assaults between inmates, for example) and some less so (number of workers' compensation claims, for example). Altogether these statistics can be indicative of the health of the institutions in which events occur. These statistics may suggest links between violence and other factors such as the legal status of inmates (remand or sentenced) and their mental health profiles, for example.

4.2.1 Incidence of Violence in the Custodial Setting

There are limitations on how incidents of assault and violence can be categorised for statistical purposes. For example, assaults are classified according to the severity of injuries sustained by each victim, yet information regarding the severity of the injury is not always available at the time the assault report is completed. In some cases the level of severity can be ascertained from related information, for example when an inmate “was escorted to hospital” but in other cases there is no supporting information given and the assault might then be regarded as “non-serious”.

“Maybe we need a way of separating the incidents - they need to be better prioritised in terms of seriousness.”
Col Kelaher, Manager, Junee CC

Statistics concerning violence are dependent on the reporting of such incidents. Inmates in correctional centres are often reluctant to report acts of violence against themselves and frequently incidents may only become apparent when a staff member notices injuries. Similarly, officers may also be reluctant to report minor incidents perpetrated against themselves. Furthermore, reporting practices may vary from centre to centre; what may be reported at one centre may be regarded as too trivial to commit to paper at another.

Assaults by Inmates against Inmates

During the 2000/01 financial year there were 235 serious assaults and 1086 non-serious assaults by inmates against inmates reported to the duty officer. This translates to a rate of 3.1 serious assaults and 14.5 non-serious assaults per 100 inmates. The total 17.6 assaults per 100 inmates during the 2000/01 financial year...
was the highest rate in the five year period examined for this report. The Metropolitan Remand Facilities (which include the MRRC, Parklea and Parramatta) recorded the highest rate of assaults at 31.3 per 100 inmates.

Assaults occurring in the year 2000 resulted in the following injuries: no injury (18 recorded incidents at a rate of 0.2 per 100 inmates), non-serious injury (1024 incidents at a rate of 14.0), serious injury (148 incidents at a rate of 2.0), injuries resulting in hospitalisation (37 incidents at a rate of 0.5), and fatalities (3 incidents). Sexual assaults were counted separately (30 incidents at a rate of 0.4). In total there were 1260 reported assaults (at a rate of 17.2).

During the same year, the correctional centres which recorded the highest rates of assaults from inmates against inmates included the MRRC (38.5), Tamworth (33.3), Parklea maximum section (32.1), Cessnock maximum section (30.6), Mulawa (28.0), Long Bay Hospital (27.4), Broken Hill (25.5), MSPC areas 1 to 4 (22.6). All centres in this list have high proportions of receptions and remand inmates. Long Bay Hospital is predominantly a centre for men with significant acute psychiatric problems.

**Serious Assaults by Inmates against Inmates**

The picture that emerges when looking only at serious assaults for each centre is quite different. The rate of serious assaults in Tamworth in 2000 was 8.8, at the MRRC 6.8, at Cessnock maximum section 6.5, and at St Heliers it was 5.3. The rate of serious assaults was significantly lower at Long Bay Hospital (1.8) and at Mulawa (1.4). One possible explanation for St Heliers having such a high rate of serious assaults is that an assault can be judged “serious” according to the treatment the inmate victim receives. Hospitalisation is one indicator of a serious assault. St Heliers does not have a 24 hour clinic on site so inmates may be taken to hospital for treatment where perhaps in another correctional centre they may be treated in the centre clinic.

"Because of the focus being on the reporting ... it does not seem apparent that it should also be about investigating rather than merely reporting..."

Lee Downes, Governor, Mulawa CC

---

35 See appendix 6, table 1
36 See appendix 6, table 2
37 See appendix 6, table 2
38 See appendix 6, table 2
The comparatively low rates of serious assaults at Long Bay Hospital compared with the overall rates of assaults of that centre must be seen in the context of the specific role of this correctional centre. The inmates at this institution tend to have mental and/or personality disorders and generally do not have "good coping skills" so - as Governor Harrison pointed out - "anything can be cause for "acting out". It is also difficult to introduce structured programs as "many of the inmates in the hospital are really not in a position to participate and the population here is very much transient".

The low rates of serious assaults at Mulawa are of particular significance in terms of the gender differences in violence. It is worth noting that while Mulawa seems to have gained a reputation as a violent centre, the reality when looking at serious assaults is quite different to public perception. Compared to most correctional centres for men, the rate of serious incidents at Mulawa is lower.

**Sexual Assaults by Inmates against Inmates**

The main impetus for the establishment of the Ministerial Reference Committee on Violence was an attempt to define the extent of sexual assaults in correctional centres and to devise effective strategies to alleviate this problem.

During 2000 sexual assaults were reported in MRRC (11), St Heliers (4), Kirkconnell (2), Junee (2), Silverwater (2), Bathurst (1), Glen Innes (1), Lithgow (1), MSPC (1), MMTC (1), Mannus (1), Mulawa (1), and during transit (2). As it is highly likely that sexual assaults are significantly under-reported, the number of reported sexual assaults indicate little.

There is some Australian research into the incidence of sexual assaults in correctional centres. The most outstanding is by David M Heilpern (now a Magistrate in northern NSW) based on interviews with young inmates at Parklea Correctional Centre.

---

39 Sunday Telegraph; 14/10/01; "Women's Prisons The Most Violent", page 9
40 See appendix 6, table 2
41 See appendix 6, table 2
42 Heilpern, D.M., 1998
The Department's own Strategy and Policy Unit in the Inmate Management Division is undertaking a review of the current sexual assault policy and procedures to ensure that there is explicit focus on the needs of the victims of sexual assault.

In the consultations for this report, issues with regard to sexual violence and assaults were identified by many staff in correctional centres. Staff in particular commented on the difficulties inmates have in relation to reporting such incidents. They also pointed to their own feeling of 'helplessness' when an assaulted inmate does not want to press charges under any circumstances. Not surprisingly, the inmates interviewed were reluctant to even broach the subject. For these reasons this report is unable to go beyond highlighting official statistical data as far as sexual violence is concerned.

**Assaults by Inmates against Officers**

Unlike assaults from inmates against inmates, serious assaults against officers have been declining over the past five years.\(^{43}\) There were 197 serious and 98 non-serious assaults against officers during the 2000/01 financial year, translating to a rate of 2.6 serious assaults and 1.3 non-serious assaults per 100 inmates.

As the rate of serious assaults is higher than non-serious assaults it may be assumed from these figures that officers under-report the number of non-serious assaults perpetrated against them. Nevertheless, the rate of non-serious assaults recorded were the highest (by a very small margin) in the five year period examined for this report. The Metropolitan Region and the Metropolitan Remand Facilities had the highest rates of assaults against officers at 5.5 and 4.7 respectively.

The Departmental data categorises assaults against officers as "striking" (includes hitting, punching or throwing a dangerous object), "AIDS related" (includes spitting in an officer's eye or open mouth), "pushing", "no injury" and "sexual assault". In 2000 there were 147 striking assaults against officers, 6 "AIDS related" assaults, 79 pushing assaults, 85 reported assaults resulting in no injury, and 3 sexual assaults against officers.\(^{44}\)

\(^{43}\) See appendix 6, table 3

\(^{44}\) See appendix 6, table 4
Higher rates of assaults against officers occurred in the maximum security unit of Long Bay Hospital (15.9), Mulawa (15.6), maximum security unit of MSPC (10.2), Tamworth (8.8); Broken Hill (6.4), Long Bay Unit (5.9), MRRC (5.8), Cessnock (5.6), and MMTC (5.0). 45

With regard to a high number of assaults against officers, Mulawa is nearly on a par with the Long Bay Hospital for similar reasons. Given the far fewer placement options for female inmates, Mulawa must cater to the needs of women with serious psychiatric problems or intellectual disabilities, for example. It is worth noting that there is no equivalent of the (forensic) Long Bay Hospital for women.

Assaults against officers by inmates at Mulawa were listed as “no injury” (9), “pushing” (9), “striking etc” (24) and “AIDS related” (2). 46 There is no indication from the available statistics about where exactly in Mulawa these incidents occurred or at what level of seriousness.

Mulawa featured as a centre with a high rate of assaults. There is a traditional view that an explanation for this can be found in the natural make-up of women. This view merely propagates the usual stereotypes that women find it difficult to get on with other women.

"It always comes back to inmate activities... Structured times for activities such as sport is crucial...and so is the link to CSI."
Dave Farrell, Regional Commander, South West Region

"...This ignores the fact that the ‘mix’ of the inmate population at Mulawa is particularly complex and that the physical environment of this correctional centre has an amalgam of old and relatively new buildings and areas. Mulawa has also had to contend with a sharp increase in female inmate numbers particularly as far as the remand population is concerned. 47 In addition, Mulawa combines in one centre the specific needs populations often separated within the men’s system, eg intellectually disabled, psychiatrically disturbed, newly received women and women on remand. It should also be noted in this context that Emu Plains recorded a relatively low rate of fights between its inmates (2.6 per 100 inmates).

45 See appendix 6, table 4
46 See appendix 6, table 4
47 For example, at the time of the 1995 Inmate Census there were 41 (13.1%) unsentenced women in full-time custody. By 1998 this had increased to 73 women on remand (20.4% of women in full-time custody). On the 10th February 2002 32% of women in full time custody were on remand (152 women). Sources: Eyland, S., 1995; Corben, S., 1998 and Weekly States for 10 February 2002.
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"Because of the focus being on the reporting ... it does not seem apparent that it should also be about investigating rather than merely reporting..."

Lee Downes, Governor, Mulawa CC

---

35 See appendix 6, table 1
36 See appendix 6, table 2
37 See appendix 6, table 2
38 See appendix 6, table 2
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The comparatively low rates of serious assaults at Long Bay Hospital compared with the overall rates of assaults of that centre must be seen in the context of the specific role of this correctional centre. The inmates at this institution tend to have mental and/or personality disorders and generally do not have “good coping skills” so - as Governor Harrison pointed out - “anything can be cause for ‘acting out’”. It is also difficult to introduce structured programs as “many of the inmates in the hospital are really not in a position to participate and the population here is very much transient”.

The low rates of serious assaults at Mulawa are of particular significance in terms of the gender differences in violence. It is worth noting that while Mulawa seems to have gained a reputation as a violent centre, the reality when looking at serious assaults is quite different to public perception. Compared to most correctional centres for men, the rate of serious incidents at Mulawa is lower.

**Sexual Assaults by Inmates against Inmates**

The main impetus for the establishment of the Ministerial Reference Committee on Violence was an attempt to define the extent of sexual assaults in correctional centres and to devise effective strategies to alleviate this problem.

During 2000 sexual assaults were reported in MRRC (11), St Heliers (4), Kirkconnell (2), Junee (2), Silverwater (2), Bathurst (1), Glen Innes (1), Lithgow (1), MSPC (1), MMTC (1), Mannus (1), Mulawa (1), and during transit (2). As it is highly likely that sexual assaults are significantly under-reported, the number of reported sexual assaults indicate little.

There is some Australian research into the incidence of sexual assaults in correctional centres. The most outstanding is by David M Heilpern (now a Magistrate in northern NSW) based on interviews with young inmates at Parklea Correctional Centre.

---

39 Sunday Telegraph; 14/10/01; “Women’s Prisons The Most Violent”, page 9
40 See appendix 6, table 2
41 See appendix 6, table 2
42 Heilpern, D.M., 1998
The Department's own Strategy and Policy Unit in the Inmate Management Division is undertaking a review of the current sexual assault policy and procedures to ensure that there is explicit focus on the needs of the victims of sexual assault.

In the consultations for this report, issues with regard to sexual violence and assaults were identified by many staff in correctional centres. Staff in particular commented on the difficulties inmates have in relation to reporting such incidents. They also pointed to their own feeling of 'helplessness' when an assaulted inmate does not want to press charges under any circumstances. Not surprisingly, the inmates interviewed were reluctant to even broach the subject. For these reasons this report is unable to go beyond highlighting official statistical data as far as sexual violence is concerned.

**Assaults by Inmates against Officers**

Unlike assaults from inmates against inmates, serious assaults against officers have been declining over the past five years.⁴³ There were 197 serious and 98 non-serious assaults against officers during the 2000/01 financial year, translating to a rate of 2.6 serious assaults and 1.3 non-serious assaults per 100 inmates.

As the rate of serious assaults is higher than non-serious assaults it may be assumed from these figures that officers under-report the number of non-serious assaults perpetrated against them. Nevertheless, the rate of non-serious assaults recorded were the highest (by a very small margin) in the five year period examined for this report. The Metropolitan Region and the Metropolitan Remand Facilities had the highest rates of assaults against officers at 5.5 and 4.7 respectively.

The Departmental data categorises assaults against officers as “striking” (includes hitting, punching or throwing a dangerous object), “AIDS related” (includes spitting in an officer's eye or open mouth), “pushing”, “no injury” and “sexual assault”. In 2000 there were 147 striking assaults against officers, 6 “AIDS related” assaults, 79 pushing assaults, 85 reported assaults resulting in no injury, and 3 sexual assaults against officers.⁴⁴

⁴³ See appendix 6, table 3
⁴⁴ See appendix 6, table 4
Higher rates of assaults against officers occurred in the maximum security unit of Long Bay Hospital (15.9), Mulawa (15.6), maximum security unit of MSPC (10.2), Tamworth (8.8); Broken Hill (6.4), Long Bay ID Unit (5.9), MRRC (5.8), Cessnock (5.6), and MMTC (5.0). 45

With regard to a high number of assaults against officers, Mulawa is nearly on a par with the Long Bay Hospital for similar reasons. Given the far fewer placement options for female inmates, Mulawa must cater to the needs of women with serious psychiatric problems or intellectual disabilities, for example. It is worth noting that there is no equivalent of the (forensic) Long Bay Hospital for women.

Assaults against officers by inmates at Mulawa were listed as “no injury” (9), “pushing” (9), “striking etc” (24) and “AIDS related” (2). 46 There is no indication from the available statistics about where exactly in Mulawa these incidents occurred or at what level of seriousness.

Mulawa featured as a centre with a high rate of assaults. There is a traditional view that an explanation for this can be found in the natural make-up of women. This view merely propagates the usual stereotypes that women find it difficult to get along with other women.

"It always comes back to inmate activities...
Structured times for activities such as sport is crucial...and so is the link to CSI."
Dave Farrell, Regional Commander, South West Region

This ignores the fact that the ‘mix’ of the inmate population at Mulawa is particularly complex and that the physical environment of this correctional centre has an amalgam of old and relatively new buildings and areas. Mulawa has also had to contend with a sharp increase in female inmate numbers particularly as far as the remand population is concerned. 47 In addition, Mulawa combines in one centre the specific needs populations often separated within the men’s system, eg intellectually disabled, psychiatrically disturbed, newly received women and women on remand. It should also be noted in this context that Emu Plains recorded a relatively low rate of fights between its inmates (2.6 per 100 inmates).

See appendix 6, table 4
See appendix 6, table 4

For example, at the time of the 1995 Inmate Census there were 41 (13.1%) unsentenced women in full-time custody. By 1998 this had increased to 73 women on remand (20.4% of women in full-time custody). On the 10th February 2002 32% of women in full time custody were on remand (152 women). Sources: Eyland, S., 1995; Corben, S., 1998 and Weekly States for 10 February 2002.
It is important to note that at Emu Plains Correctional Centre for women, there were only three reported assaults against officers (at a rate of 2.0) as it demonstrates that women per se are not violent against officers and that other factors must be taken into account such as mental health status and/or the physical environment.\(^{48}\)

**Fights in Correctional Centres**

In 2000, there were 645 fights between inmates in full-time custody reported. This is a slight increase on the 611 fights reported in 1999.\(^{49}\) An overall rate of 8.8 fights per 100 inmates was recorded. Centres with the highest rates of fights were: Long bay ID Unit (70.6), Cessnock maximum (27.5), Long Bay Hospital (21.2), Mulawa (20.6), MMTC (17.5), MMRC (14.2), Broken Hill (12.8), Tamworth (12.3), Grafton medium security unit (12.2), Parramatta (12.1), Bathurst medium security unit (11.9), Lithgow (10.7), MSPC Areas 1-4 (10.7), and Goulburn maximum security unit (10.4).\(^{50}\)

Again, the centres with the high rates of assaults tend to be those with inmates who are intellectually disabled or psychiatrically disturbed, followed by those centres with higher numbers of reception and remand inmates and inmates in transit between centres. Also featuring are centres, or parts thereof, where there is a lack of structured non-vocational activities.

**Assaults and Fights in Periodic Detention Centres**

It is difficult to gauge rates of assaults and fights in periodic detention centres as the number of detainees is much lower than the number of full-time inmates. For example, there was one assault at the Windsor PDC in 2000, yet this translates to a rate of 5.0. Overall there were 9.5 assaults per 100 detainees compared with 17.2 per 100 inmates in full time custody. At the same time, a rate of 3.5 with regards to fights was recorded for detainees whilst the rate of fights between inmates in full-time custody was 8.8.\(^{51}\)

\(^{48}\) See appendix 6, table 4

\(^{49}\) See appendix 6, table 5.

\(^{50}\) See appendix 6, table 6.

\(^{51}\) See appendix 6, table 7
Deaths in Custody

The numbers of murders, suicides and drug overdoses resulting in death in custody are too small to be expressed as a rate and too small to reveal any trends over the five years examined for this report. During the 2000/2001 financial year there was one murder, nine (9) suicides and one (1) drug overdose resulting in death. All of these deaths were male inmates. 52

Self-Harm in Custody

Between 1996 and 2000 there were no significant changes in the rates of self-harm. In 2000 there were 574 incidents of self-harm, at a rate of 7.8 per 100 inmates in full-time custody. 53

The statistics which examine rates of self-harm are analysed on individual correctional centre basis. As the large majority of women are residing in either Mulawa or Emu Plains, these centres were examined to get an impression of the rates of self-harming amongst women. The results over the five year period fluctuate quite markedly. In 1996 the percentage of all self-harm incidents by women was 9.9 percent; in 1997 it was 10.2 percent; in 1998 it dropped significantly to 5.0 percent and again in 1999 to 3.2 percent. 54

In 2000 the percentage of self-harm incidents occurring at either Mulawa or Emu Plains increased dramatically to 12.0 percent. There is no conclusive explanation for this. It may be related to a real rise in self-harm, changes in reporting practices or a combination of both. These figures refer to the number of incidents of self-harm, and may therefore be distorted if an inmate was repeatedly committing self-harm.

Almost all self-harm incidents by women occurred in Mulawa, with only a small proportion in Emu Plains.

Offences in Custody

The Research and Statistics Unit collects figures on the number of misconduct charges dealt with by correctional centre Governors. The project team has included this data in this report as it is yet another indicator of the "health of an institution".

52 See appendix 6, table 8
53 See appendix 6, table 9
54 See appendix 6, table 10
Possible misconduct charges include:

- abusive behaviour
- fighting or assaults
- charges against good order
- stealing
- property damage
- failure to attend muster
- refusal to provide urine samples
- alcohol charges
- other drug charges
- unauthorised possession/misuse of condom

It should be noted that more serious cases of misconduct, for example serious assaults, may be dealt with directly by the police and not counted amongst misconduct charges dealt with by the centre Governor. Furthermore, misconduct charges cannot be made if the offender is not known, thus the figures are an indication only.

During the 2000/2001 financial year there were 12174 misconduct offences heard by centre Governors. The rate of misconduct charges (163 per 100 inmates) was at its lowest during the five year period examined for this project.55

Workers Compensation Claims

The Occupational Health and Safety Unit of the Department collates information pertaining to workers compensation claims. Over the five year period examined for this report, there has been a reduction in the number of claims made by Departmental officers. It should be noted that claims can still be made with regard to an event which might have occurred several years earlier and therefore the figures presented in table 12 of appendix 6 are subject to change. The apparent reduction in workers compensation claims may be related to the reduction of assaults against officers over the corresponding period.

4.2.2 Incidence of Violence in Community Setting

At present details of violence and aggression by clients against Probation and Parole Officers are not collected or collated by the Department's Research and Statistics section. Therefore there are no official indicators of the prevalence or seriousness

55 See appendix 6, table 11
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of violence experienced by officers of the Probation and Parole Service. There is, however, anecdotal evidence to suggest that violence and aggression are issues that all officers have to keep in mind through the course of their work.

During the consultation process it became apparent that most Probation and Parole Officers had been in a situation where a client had become aggressive and/or violent. There was an overwhelming sense among these officers that dealing with aggressive and/or violent clients was “part of the job”. Almost without exception - but in contrast to many staff working in correctional centres - the officers acknowledged that the reasons for aggressive or violent behaviour were usually the result of client frustration with a frustrating system. Staff reported that they most commonly dealt with a volatile situation by either

“We have to acknowledge that we deal with a population which is at risk of violence. Staff might be ‘desensitised’ to the issues surrounding that and might follow a model where they ‘befriend’ and ‘support’ and at the same time they are in the frontline of breaching people”.
Catriona McComish, Assistant Commissioner Probation and Parole

“talking the client down” or, when they felt the situation to be too threatening, by leaving the scene. This might sound easier than it actually is in practice. For example, a number of Probation and Parole Officers said that when officers were unable to complete a meeting with a client who was very aggressive, there was a tendency to insinuate that these officers may not be capable of doing their job properly.

Strategies to reduce the potential for violence and aggression identified by Probation and Parole staff focused largely on the physical layout of offices such as the visibility of meeting rooms and use of duress alarms.

During the consultations for this report, Probation and Parole staff spoke against including the reporting of violent and aggressive incidents in the Department’s established data collecting systems. Yet, some recognised the need for a planned response to violent incidents. Many staff said that they debriefed after difficult interviews with colleagues or their team leaders and found that satisfactory. Others, particularly those who had been involved in more serious incidents wished for “better support” from the Department.
5 Project Findings and Analysis

5.1 Consultations - Results and Common Themes

The consultations can be summarised in broad themes from which this report draws its direction when devising its recommendations.

- improvement in the offender assessment area and specifically the need for a standardised risk assessment tool which provides information as far as the propensity for violence is concerned
- implementation of minimum standards in line with those developed for Junee Correctional Centre with regard to violence prevention and reductions, effective grievance procedures for disputes between inmates and between staff and inmates
- review of the current hierarchy of sanctions and privileges with a view to a more sophisticated system of reward for appropriate behaviour
- clearer delineation of staff roles (eg involvement of case officers and effective structures to foster team approach between custodial, non-custodial, CHS and Probation and Parole staff)
- training/development to provide the necessary skills for staff dealing with challenging behaviours with particular focus on e-learning
- integrated programming and standardisation of programming with focus on violence prevention, violence reduction and anger management
- broadening of the current focus of incident reporting
- review of incident reporting in the Probation and Parole Service and possible inclusion in the Department’s overall statistical data collection

5.1.1 Governors

Twenty (20) Governors (17 males and 3 females) were formally interviewed.

Eleven (11) confirmed that there were “hot spots” for violence between inmates in their centre; eleven (11) also said that there were “particular times when violence between inmates (was) more likely to occur.”
Talking up Communications - Talking down Violence

In summary and generally speaking, in the experience of Governors, violence is more likely to occur between inmates where and when there is no immediate supervision.

The exception to this is where there are inmates who are particularly vulnerable and/or unstable, for example at the Long Bay Hospital’s D-Ward and the Mum Shirl Unit at Mulawa, at remand centres and centres with remand and transit areas (eg, 7 and 9 wing of the MSPC and pods of the MRRC).

“There is a reduction of violence from inmates against officers but there is an increase if violence from inmates against inmates”

A summary of how most Governors assess the situation - this corresponds with the Department’s official statistics.

As far as particular times for violence are concerned, three (3) Governors mentioned specifically “after buy-ups” (Goulburn, Grafton, Lithgow). In minimum security centres (Glen Innes, Kirkconnell and Oberon) the time after lock-in of inmates in their units - not in their cells - seems to be particularly pertinent.

Operational Strategies

The question “what operational strategies do you have in place to reduce the incidence of violence between inmates at your centre” drew a wide variety of answers. The only common theme shared by nine (9) of the Governors is the use of separation of groups and individuals within the centre itself and/or transfer of the culprits to another correctional centre. For example:

“When there is an incident against staff - segregate immediately” (Bathurst)

“Separation of ethnic and racial groups...” (Goulburn)

“Constantly review who is living together... constantly have to move and separate them within the centre...failing changes to behaviour, moving them out” (Kirkconnell)

“...earlier this year we started separating inmates from certain ethnic groups” (MRRC)

Only three (3) Governors referred to “programs” as a possible effective violence reduction strategy.

Five (5) Governors shared the opinion that well established intel processes can be an effective violence reduction strategy.
Three (3) of the interviewed Governors specifically mentioned the importance of interaction between staff and inmates as part of dynamic security as a viable violence reduction strategy applied in their centre.

**Causes for Inmate Violence**

The answers from the Governors to the question “What do you think are the main causes of violence between inmates” vary as much as those from their respective Managers of Programs. 56

Nine (9) Governors mentioned “racial issues and incompatible groups” as a source for friction. Two (2) Governors used the term “gangs” in this context and one (1) Governor was at pains to point out that one was dealing with “ethnic based groupings, not gangs”.

Seventeen (17) referred to drugs and related issues as a major source of violence between inmates.

Only three (3) Governors (Mulawa, Long Bay Hospital, Kirkconnell) cited mental health issues as causes for violence.

As with the Program Managers, only a small number of Governors (6) made a connection between the general gaol environment, frustration and violence between inmates.

Four (4) Governors specifically mentioned “boredom” and “lack of activities and positive outlets for energy”.

**Role of Staff**

One (1) Governor conceded that poor “staff interactions” with inmates may contribute to aggression and violence on part of inmates. This Governor had doubts about the quality of some of the officers’ skills in diffusing difficult situations.

56 See section 5.1.3 of this report
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Of the six (6) Governors who answered the question whether they thought “Correctional Officers (are) effective in dealing with violence and/or aggressive behaviour, three (3) answered in the affirmative and three said “yes and no”.

For example:

“Officers on the whole are effective in dealing with violence and aggressive behaviour on the part of inmates. Very much so - they are very good. But some individuals can lack communication skills and can actually inflame a situation…” (Lithgow)

“...close interaction between staff and inmates, the involvement of the case officers and generally all the dynamic security aspects are part and parcel of effective violence reduction.”

Bill Fittler, Governor, Oberon CC

The other three answers are quite similar:

“The ones who are good at this tend to be placed for work at the ACMU - some others are sometimes aggressive themselves and that doesn’t help and tempers flare up” (Bathurst)

“Depends - sometimes ‘yes’; some officers are good at dealing with situations in a physical sense but not necessarily at dealing with other issues surrounding the incident” (MRRC)

“Depends - the regular officers at the MSU and MPU for example are great; others are sometimes scared or can’t talk it down” (Mulawa)

Apart from the Governors of Grafton and Kirkconnell, the others said that they had “a designated intel officer” at their centre. The Governors of Broken Hill, John Morony, Mannus and Oberon pointed out that their intel officers have to fulfil “other duties” as well.

Intel in Violence Prevention

When asked “how the intel process works in (their) centre” issues surrounding the establishment and the functioning of the intel positions were raised. The Governor of Grafton, for example, described the situation at his centre as “unsatisfactory” because “two or three people do it part-time ... can be very fragmented”; the Governor of Mulawa who praised her intel officer (“supposedly one of the best”) also made the point: “We are trying to get commissioned officers to be more pro-active in this area”.
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It appears that only six (6) centres (Bathurst, Goulburn, Lithgow, MRRC, Mulawa and Silverwater) have intel officers whose positions “cannot be stripped”.

Program Staff and Intel

Nine (9) Governors are complimentary in their assessment of ISP staff’s role “in relation to collecting intel”. Others point out some of the pitfalls. For example:

“...they are less involved than uniformed staff which is a cultural hang-over...”
(Goulburn)

“They don’t have a role. If they become aware of something, they pass it on. This is not their primary role.” (Grafton)

“Could be better. The culture fostered in the past was not to take too big a role in this. This is changing - they need to know the value in it.” (Silverwater)

The vast majority (18) of the interviewed Governors answered the questions whether there had been “any violent incidents between inmates in your centre this year” in the affirmative; only two answered in the negative.

All interviewed Governors (20) said that all incidents were reported via the established Departmental procedures.

Frequency of Incidents

Twelve (12) Governors said that in their centre there had been “violent incidents between inmates and staff this year”. Seven (7) said there had been no such incidents.

The answer that “most violence against staff is verbal” is also typical. This is not to belittle the sometimes dangerous situations Correctional Officers and ISP staff find themselves in. 

“...We meet with the Inmate Development Committee once a month and speak to them about what is going on ... they may alert us about their concerns about fellow inmates...”

Barbara Andrews, Governor, Kirkconnell CC

Violence Prevention Program

When asked whether there are “anti-violence and/or anger management programs” offered at their centre, three (3) Governors said that the question should be referred to their Managers of Programs; only one (1) Governor referred to the Inmate Services and Programs Plan (ISPP) submitted for their centre. Seventeen (17)
Talking up Communications - Talking down Violence

answered the question in the affirmative and three (3) said no such programs were offered at their centre. Not surprisingly the latter include Tamworth and the MRRC, neither of which are "gaols of classification" and therefore have different program and services requirements in comparison to other centres.

Nine (9) Governors reported that they had "referred inmates to the Violence Prevention Program at Long Bay". Eight (8) (including as one would expect the Governors of the two correctional centres for women) said they had not.

Inmate Development Committees

Twelve (12) Governors said that "Inmate Development Committees feature in violence reduction strategies" at their centre. Six (6) which include the Governors of the two correctional centres for women did not see such a role for these committees. Three of these six share the opinion that there are pitfalls to 'using' the IDCs in this regard; they say these committees have a specific role and could not be expected to "act as the police".

Those Governors who answered in the affirmative seem to share an opinion that all communication with inmates potentially contributes to violence reduction.

Aboriginal Family and Elders Visiting Schemes

Governors were asked about the connection between Aboriginal Family and Elders Visiting Schemes and violence reduction strategies. Some Governors pointed out difficulties they had in implementing such schemes; for example:

"The local Elders are quite overloaded because every organisation here wants their involvement..." (Broken Hill)

"It's difficult to have it going in a consistent manner..." (Grafton)

"...the Elders would have to come a long way..." (Oberon)

Only four (4) Governors made unqualified comments regarding a positive connection between such visiting initiatives and violence reduction strategies, others were more cautious, for example:

"We haven't got the research to see if it works..." (Lithgow)

"I can see a connection but I don't think the effectiveness in this regard is high" (MRRC)
Relevant Training

The answers to the question "Have you or your staff had any training in the areas of violence prevention, strategic communication or dealing with aggression" need to be looked at in detail as a simple 'yes' (9) or 'no' (11) does not provide an informative picture.

Of those who answered in the affirmative, the details are sketchy. For example:

"Some staff have done conflict resolution through the academy" (Emu Plains)

"It's provided in basic training but not when one is further into a career and further from training. Access to courses is limited and competitive." (Goulburn)

"We have facilitators from the 'Alternatives to Violence' organisation come in to train the adult nucleus inmates and ISP staff. We had good feedback but unfortunately no custodial officers were involved." (Oberon)

The most perfect yet unspecific picture is painted by the Governor of Junee:

"All staff received initial and ongoing training in regard to this. This includes program staff."

5.1.2 Inmates

The majority of the inmates interviewed for this report were living at Kirkconnell, John Morony II, MRRC and Mulawa correctional centres. In total, fifty-six (56) inmates (16 women and 40 men) were interviewed in ten (10) correctional centres.

Thirty-four of the 56 interviewed (26 male and 8 female) said they had been "involved in a violent incident while in gaol". Thirteen (13) men and eight (8) women reported that they had never been involved in such an incident.

---

57 Of the 16 women interviewed, four (4) were at Emu Plains and twelve (12) at Mulawa.

58 Berrima, Cessnock, Emu Plains, John Morony I and II, Kirkconnell, MRRC, Mulawa, and Tamworth. Please note: only three (3) inmates were formally interviewed in Goulburn; all were 'on protection'. The incidence of violence is high in Goulburn in comparison to other correctional centres and Goulburn is the most 'segregated' gaol in NSW. The project team when visiting Goulburn focused on speaking to staff (formally and informally) and in documenting the issues prevalent at this centre liaised with the 'Goodstone project' dealing with 'Security Threat Groups' for which comprehensive feedback from Goulburn inmates has been sought.
Nine (9) (6 male and 3 female) reported that they had been “at the recipient end” of violence and five (5) said they were the actual instigator of an incident.

**Situations to Avoid**

In the context of the above, the answers to the question “if you felt like you were going to be violent, what would you do?” are revealing. Only two (2) inmates stated that in certain circumstances they would act violently. The majority (44) either saw themselves only acting violent when it was a case of “self-defence” or claimed that they would simply walk away, ask to be locked in their cell, hit a punching bag and talk to somebody to take their mind off the matter.

“You get things done by acting violently. The system enforces the idea because you can get things through violence.”

*Inmate, Goulburn CC*

Phrases such as “take myself away from the situation”, “ask to be locked in”, “take time out”, “go to the gym”, “talk to somebody” are typical answers - some of the lessons of anger management courses seem to have made an impression. It appears that inmates are well aware of some of the standard relapse prevention strategies. What might be missing are the opportunities to put the lessons learnt into practice because as one inmate described his experience, “violence in prison is part of life”.

“In the yards you’re all in together in a small space. There is no seating. In winter it’s cold and wet and you’re fighting over places to stay dry. You fight over games and out of boredom.”

*Inmate, Goulburn CC*

The answers to the questions about “what is the best way to avoid violence in gaol” further add to the inconsistency. Replies which are best summed up as “stick to yourself” and “don’t get involved in the politics” were given by twenty-three (23) inmates; “do not get involved in drugs” was stated by seven (7) inmates. Eight (8) inmates voiced a rather resigned opinion and thought violence could not be avoided as it could happen at any time and one could be in the wrong place at the wrong time.

**Concern for Safety**

Thirteen (13) inmates answered in the affirmative when asked whether there was “much fighting or violence between inmates” at their centre. Of these thirteen (13), nine (9) were female. The majority (32) of the male inmates said that there “wasn’t much fighting” in the centre they were currently living. A minority of inmates (11) (7 men and 4 women) stated that they sometimes “feel threatened or unsafe” in their centre.
When inmates were asked to further explain how they felt about their safety, a significant number of inmates particularly those in John Morony and Kirkconnell were adamant that their safety was enhanced by the fact that “nobody wants to get tipped” - particularly not to Goulburn or Junee.

The ‘vote’ was split on whether there were particular times and/or places in their correctional centre where violence was more likely to occur. Twenty-eight (19 men and 9 women) answered in the affirmative and 25 (19 men and 6 women) answered in the negative.

Program Participation

Twenty-five (25) male and eight (8) female inmates reported that they were “taking part in courses or programs”; after further inquiry, it became clear that this did not necessarily mean that they were currently engaged in the named activities but might have done so in the past or were still waiting for it to happen during this period of incarceration.

Twenty-two (22) male inmates said that they had at some stage (not necessarily during their current custodial sentence) participated in an anger management and/or a violence prevention program; six (6) women also answered in the affirmative. Participation in these courses could have occurred during a previous period of incarceration and / or as a community-based activity.

Participation in IT skills training (either on its own or as part of another educational course) were named by six (6) inmates; the same number said they were involved or had been involved in an AOD program and seven (7) inmates said they were participating in arts and/or music activities.  

59

The courses listed are as follows: cooking class (1) Maths and English (2) literacy / numeracy (1) AOD (6) HIV peer educator (1) graphic design (1) art/music / pottery (7) IT course/skills (6) anger management and alternatives to violence (4) VPP (2) life management / self awareness (2) fire fighting (1) horticulture (1) year 10 / HSC (3) fathering course (1) enough is enough (1) first aid (2) armed robbery course (2) marketing course (1) job search course (1) hospitality (1) correspondence course (2) small business (1) quit smoking (1)
Of the four (4) women interviewed in Emu Plains, two (2) said they were taking part in courses or programs: one (1) in a certificate 2 in information technology and one (1) in pottery.

Only three (3) of the twelve (12) women interviewed in Mulawa reported that they were engaged in courses and/or programs; two (2) were completing the Lifestyles Unit Program (Conlon) and one (1) the AOD program as stipulated by the Drug Court.60

"These days more is done. Officers interfere more and break things up. Also, when case management was brought in, that helped."

Inmate, John Morony CC

In summary, forty-nine (49) inmates said they were engaged in courses and/or programs; some inmates nominated more than one program. It is interesting to note that none of the inmates - when asked whether they were taking part in any courses or programs - mentioned that they were working in Corrective Services Industries. It is clear that CSI employment is seen as “work” and not as a “program”.

Perceived Changes

Twenty-eight (28) male and eight (8) female inmates reported that they had been in custody previously; twenty-one (21) male inmates observed that over the time they had been “coming into custody”, “things have changed as far as violence between inmates is concerned”. Eight (8) women said they also see “change”; eight (8) women did not offer an opinion in this regard which is possibly related to the fact that they did not have a long experience with the custodial system.

"It’s gotten worse. They’re young and they’re stupid and they want to make a name for themselves."

Inmate, Mulawa CC

Of those who stated that “things had changed”, twelve (12) male inmates said that the changes were “for the worse”; six (6) women shared this view. The most common reasons for this change for the worse seem to be “availability of drugs”, the emergence of racially based groups, increase in number of younger inmates (“no respect and no regard for the consequences”) and the use of weapons (“before it was fists now it’s shivas”).

Those inmates who stated that the change they have seen was for the better did not give specific reasons.

60 This relatively low rate is due to the fact that of the twelve (12) interviewed at Mulawa, three (3) were under a segregation order accommodated in the ‘MPU’ (induction wing) and four (4) were still in ‘induction’ waiting for placement in the ‘main’.
5.1.3 Program Managers

Eighteen (18) Managers of Programs (10 male and 8 female) were interviewed[61].

The opening question was designed to give the Managers of Programs an opportunity to present what they thought are the “main causes of violence between inmates”:

- nine (9) said that one of the main reasons were issues associated with drugs and gambling (stand-overs, pay-backs);
- seven (7) referred to “racial and cultural issues” as a source for tension (but only two used the term ‘ethnic gangs’ in this context);
- six (6) blamed “imported problems from the outside” and associated possible pay-backs;
- five (5) made a connection to “boredom” and “not enough to do”;
- four (4) point to struggles over “power and status”;
- the same number (4) used the term “frustration”;
- three (3) mentioned personality disorders and/or other mental health/psychiatric issues.

Only three (3) Managers of Programs made a more broad link to the actual gaol environment itself which in their estimation contributed significantly to violence and aggression.

Hot Spots and Intel

According to the daily synopsis reports, both Tamworth and the MMTC are hot spots for violence between inmates. In addition, there are other centres (eg, Goulburn) where the difficult physical gaol environment should not rate a mention when naming the “causes of violence between inmates”.

“A correctional centre can be a violent environment which exacerbates whatever problems offenders bring with them...”

Janet Ruecroft, Program Manager Kirkconnell

All interviewed Managers of Programs showed a detailed understanding and appreciation of the intel processes operating at their centres and saw themselves and their programs and services staff as an integral part of these processes.

---

[61] Berrima, Cessnock, Erin Plains, Glen Innes, Goulburn, Grafton, John Morony, Kirkconnell, Lithgow, MSCP, Mannus, MMTC, MRRC, Mulawa, Oberon, Parklea, St Heliers and Tamworth
Only one (1) Manager of Programs said that there was no intel officer in her correctional centre but pointed to specific information gathering mechanisms at this centre: “Although there is no designated intel officer here, everybody takes some responsibility particularly the Program Manager and the Manager of Security”.

**Awareness of Operational Strategies**

Sixteen (16) Managers of Programs answered the question “Are you aware of any operational strategies designed to reduce the incidents of violence between inmates at your centre?” in the affirmative; only two (2) denied having such knowledge.

The details of the answers to the above question are worth noting:

- Of the two who answered in the negative one (1) said: “There are no formal strategies - anger management groups are voluntary so it comes down to the individual...making this place as humane as possible...”; the other did not provide any further details.

- Of those who answered in the affirmative seven (7) mentioned “case management” specifically.

- Eight (8) Managers of Programs mentioned that the placement of inmates / separation of individuals and groups in their centres is an “operational strategy” permanently applied.

Two (2) identified intel as a major operational strategy in this regard and not surprisingly they are the Managers of Programs at the two main maximum security institutions - Goulburn and Lithgow.

“All well supported programs ... a comprehensive approach... inmate delegates, Aboriginal mentors, peer educators, Phoenix Program, Toast Masters - they are all violence reduction strategies”

*Alex Apostolatis, Program Manager, Cessnock*

Two (2) Managers of Programs mentioned specifically that transferring inmates to another correctional centre is used as a violence reduction strategy. The Manager of Programs at Kirkconnell said that “perpetrators of violence get moved” out of the centre; the Manager of St Heliers also said that inmates might get transferred to another centre with the difference being that those who are moved from here are the ones needing protection or segregation 62 which in her opinion results in a situation in which “perpetrators of violence just get new victims”.

---

62 St Heliers does not have the facilities required for this.
Although the question asked specifically for "operational strategies", it is still surprising that only three (3) Managers of Programs included an emphasis on a holistic programming approach as a violence reduction instrument.

**Strategic Role of Inmate Development Committee**

When asked whether the "Inmate Development Committee feature(s) in violence reduction strategies at your centre", only seven (7) Managers of Programs answered in the affirmative. Ten (10) did not ascribe such a role to the IDC.

Of those who saw the IDC 'used' for such a purpose, four (4) ascribed quite a pro-active role to it; for example:

"We've asked the IDC to come on board to manage a situation." (Berrima)

"As soon as you start calling things 'violence prevention' you turn women off. The Lifestyles Program has had excellent results in this regard even though it is not set up to specifically deal with these issues" Nick Kailis, Program Manager, Mulawa

"We get them to disseminate information." (Emu Plains)

"...in fundamental ways - they are pro-actively asked to intervene when necessary" (John Morony)

"...very much a big role - often the IDC raises issues but management also tests new initiatives on them..." (Oberon)

"Since issues are discussed in the open, the IDC contributes significantly." (Mannus)

Of those ten (10) who did not see a violence reduction role for the IDC, three (3) see their IDCs at their centre being used "mainly for general maintenance stuff".

**Referrals to the Long Bay VPP**

Ten (10) Managers of Programs stated that they had referred male inmates from their centre to the VPP for men at Long Bay. Four (4) Managers of Programs of correctional centres for men answered this question in the negative.

The answers to the follow-up questions "how many have been accepted" and "of
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those who were not accepted, why not?” vary significantly and are with a few exceptions not very specific:

“No more than 5 from JM 1 and one or two from JM 2 - all were accepted” (John Morony)

“One only - still in the process of going there …” (Kirkconnell 63)

“On average six or seven each year which is an issue because really they should be sent before they come to Oberon. About 50 percent get accepted and we puzzle over that.” (Oberon)

“20 -30 referrals but I am unsure about acceptances - it takes such a long time” (Grafton)

The answer from the Tamworth a/Manager of Programs is perplexing: “Two referred but nil accepted; both still had court and had not been sentenced”. Since the access criteria to the Long Bay VPP clearly state that the program is for sentenced inmates only, it is surprising that the two inmates were referred in the first place:

Aggression and Violence Against Staff

Ten (10) Managers of Programs (including the ones from the two correctional centres for women) said that they were “aware of violent incidents between inmates and staff this year”. Eight (8) said no such incidents had taken place so far this year.

For the Emu Plains Correctional Centre, the situation was described as “verbal violence - some inmates have been problematic for IDS staff” and for Mulawa the Manager of Programs said there had been “lots” of such incidents “generally against custodial staff. Against ISP staff it’s only been in the MSU by psychiatric inmates. There is a lot of anger at nursing staff ... generally verbal tirades.”

The descriptions from the Managers of Programs in the eight (8) centres for men

---

63 Kirkconnell inmates are protection inmates and inmates participating in the Long Bay VPP cannot be on protection; Kirkconnell is in the process of establishing a VPP satellite program.
where they answered the question in the affirmative, range in intensity from “threatening language including against ISP staff” and “spitting, biting ... and a couple of minor assaults” to “a doctor was grabbed around the neck”, “a teacher was sexually assaulted” and “a welfare officer was taken hostage”.

Eight (8) Managers of Programs said that they “officially reported” incidents this year.

Possible Reasons for Violence

When asked what in their opinion “were the reasons for these incidents”, two (2) referred to “mental health problems” (MMTC and MRRC); the rest of the answers vary and range in summary from “inmates’ frustration, for example when they can’t contact their family and when they don’t get what they want” (Emu Plains) to “the inmates are newly received and they are drug traumatised or experiencing withdrawals...” (Grafton) and “...staff shortages and lock-downs leading to frustration...” (MMTC) “get mixed stories - some officers contribute...not a major problem but it does happen; also pill parade / medication” (Mulawa) and “the nature of the person; some people are naturally violent...” (Tamworth).

Twelve (12) Managers of Programs (including the two from the correctional centres for women) stated that there were “identified Aboriginal mentors” at their centre; six (6) answered in the negative.

Visiting and Mentoring Schemes

When asked whether there was an “Aboriginal family and elders visiting initiative in place” at their centre, six (6) answered in the affirmative and eleven (11) in the negative. The Manager of Programs of Mannus said that such an initiative was not existing “in a formal sense” and her counterpart at Oberon said that his centre “would love such a scheme” and the staff there were “working on it”.

Nine (9) Managers of Programs are emphatic in their general support for the notion that there is “a connection between such initiatives and violence reduction strategies. The details of these affirmative answers, however, show an awareness of the complexity of the issues which can be associated with these issues. Some examples are:

“...the mentor program is extremely important .... with regard to the family/elders visiting initiative, we had a good program but it has fallen over due to problems amongst Aboriginal families in town.” (Glen Innes)
"Absolutely but not just for Aboriginal inmates. A major thread of programming for the coming year will involve families." (John Morony)

"An Elders initiative is difficult to implement here as the Koori inmates are not from the local community." (Lithgow)

"They are the key strategies but part of the problem is the scale of their involvement and finding the 'down time' to do these things." (MRRC)

Only one (1) Manager of Programs articulated doubts in this regard: "Not really because the violence is usually on an incidental basis..." but she also concedes that "maybe it does help to alleviate some pressure on the inmate".

Three (3) Managers of Programs have similar doubts but they are specifically related to experiences and conditions in their work place:

"Not particularly in our centre - Koiris are very rarely involved in violence here..." (Oberon)

"We have encouraged the program but there is not a lot of support from the community." (St Heliers)

"It's difficult to say - the visitors have only been coming in for a short time and it's too early to tell." (Mulawa)

Twelve (12) Managers of Programs (including the two from the correctional centres for women) said that they or their staff "have had any training in the areas of violence prevention, strategic communication or dealing with aggression". Six (6) answered in the negative.

Since psychologists and AOD workers tend to have such training as part of their professional development, it is not surprising that twelve (12) Managers of Programs answered in the affirmative.

5.1.4 Nurse Unit Managers

Generally speaking all DCS and CHS staff consulted for this project agreed that the relationship between the two Departments is crucial to effective violence reduction. Still, in the course of this project it became evident that there are processes missing which could enhance the formal co-operation of DCS and CHS staff in this area and the results of the consultations with the Nurse Unit Managers (NUMs) support
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this observation. Ten (10) Nurse Unit Managers (NUMs) were interviewed using a questionnaire.

Communication

Six (6) NUMs were adamant that there is not “much communication between CHS, IDS and custodial staff on issues of violence”; the three NUMs (3) who said that there was a satisfactory level of communication in this regard, reported that there were established processes at their centre to facilitate communication which are utilised for all sorts of issues and not only for discussions concerning violence:

“There is a greater understanding among all staff that it’s not just about people being bad but we must see that simple responses around punishment are not always the answers. Incidents of spontaneous and planned violence need different approaches.

Richard Matthews, Chief Executive Officer, Corrections Health Service

Of those who answered the question in the negative, three (3) said that communication between the sections only happens “after an incident has occurred”; two (2) stated that there was “virtually no communication” between CHS and other staff.

Working with Challenging Clients

Having to deal with difficult behaviour appears to be something NUMs have learnt to expect. Four (4) of the ten (10) NUMs interviewed stated that they dealt with inmates who are aggressive on a regular basis; six (6) said that dealing with aggressive inmates did not occur on a regular basis. However, five (5) acknowledged that dealing with aggressive behaviour is something they sometimes have to contend with, maybe “not on a regular basis but it happens fairly frequently”.

NUMs at five (5) of the ten (10) centres identified particular times or places at the clinic when and where violence is more likely to occur. Two (2) referred to places and

64 Bathurst, Broken Hill, Goulburn, Kirkconnell, Lithgow, Long Bay Hospital, Mannus, Mulawa, Oberon and Parramatta
times outside the clinic area where there was a greater likelihood for violence and aggression: “in the holding cells particularly with new receptions and after lock-downs when the gaol is overcrowded” (Mulawa) and “in the yard area - prior to buy-up and when inmates run out of tobacco”. (LB Hospital)

Two (2) NUMs said that inmates might show their frustration and anger when they are refused a medical certificate to take a day off work (Mannus and Kirkconnell). Another two (2) cited methadone distribution (“pill/sick parade”) as a time when inmates might get angry when an inmate either refuses to take their prescribed medication, or the clinic nurse deems medication requested by an inmate is not warranted. (Mulawa and Lithgow)

**Causes of Violence**

When asked to comment whether they saw “... any link between medication / waiting time for medication and violence”, the above responses were confirmed; five (5) NUMs said there was a link and four (4) answered in the negative.

As in the case of other staff, there initially seemed to be a reluctance on part of Nurse Unit Managers to acknowledge the actual correctional centre environment as a source for frustration and thus for expressions of anger and/or violence. Similar to the attitudes of Correctional Officers, NUMs also look for the triggers for violence within the individual inmates themselves.

“It’s the perception of the individual we’re dealing with - if we don’t give them the medication they want, they storm off or are aggressive...” (Kirkconnell)

There were exceptions to this perception. A reference to the environment and personal individual socialisation was, however, only tentatively made.

“Generally we are dealing with people with low frustration levels; society and the system teach them to react - like when you’re bombastic and aggressive you might get what you want but it also may blow up in your face but you’re prepared to gamble on that.” (Lithgow)

Yet, when at the end of the questionnaire, the NUMs were given an opportunity to voice their ideas about what they thought “could be done to reduce the violence between inmates”, a very different picture emerged.

While all interviewed NUMs said that this was a “difficult” question because of the “type of people we’re dealing with”, they also stressed “overcrowding”, “inmates [being] frustrated with the system” and “boredom” related to the lack of activities for inmates and the relatively short time they have out of cell as issues which needed
urgent attention. They named “cultural diversity” in the inmate population as a particular issue with which managers and policy makers had not yet come to terms in a manner which helped diffuse rather than inflame aggression and violence.

Most NUMs showed great understanding of the complexity of inmate management and were eager to point to possible solutions:

“We have to have sufficient number of custodial staff to support the inmates’ structured day which assures appropriate access to programs and the oval.” (Kirkconnell)

“We need to look at the programs we currently offer and review them ... We don’t have enough AOD workers to (deal with) inmates with regards to the problems they may have ... There is a lack of role models and there is the whole issue of sexual assault which is not dealt with at all and is hidden.” (Kirkconnell)

“It’s the simple things which should be changed - being locked in from 3.30 pm till 8am is particularly horrific in summer here - access to linen and clean mattresses and pillows can be difficult...” (Bathurst)

“We need aggression management so that inmates get more skilled in problem solving. We need more activities and more courses.” (Lithgow)

“It is important that inmates are assessed ... so that all association and relationship issues can be identified; being locked up for 12 to 15 hours can be a very alienating experience...” (Mannus)

“We probably have to improve the physical environment - it affects the mood. We need training for staff so they can deal with aggressive behaviour and reduce overcrowding.” (Mualawa)

“...having programs...the structured day helps but in reality it’s often not very structured ... we know the most powerful form of influence regarding behaviour is the relationship aspect and role models - for example, here inmates never have a meal sitting at a table - that really hinders the development of social skills...” (Parramatta)

“Violence by women against themselves and why they do this, that needs to be looked at” (Mualawa)

Maybe not quite in the same league is the following observation by one NUM who was adamant that “inmates need to be put in an area where they don’t have so much
time on their hands - I think sending them to boot camps without the weapons would be a good idea...”. While a significant body of literature points to the fact that boot camps are ineffective in terms of reducing recidivism and/or violence this NUM at least made the connection between what actively happens to somebody inevitably influences behaviour and actions.

Safe Working Environment

Six (6) NUMs reported that they did not feel their personal safety threatened at work. There was, however, a recognition for the need to take “the usual precautions” such as having a “custodial presence” in the clinic.

“We have an 8am to 4pm day and we are all competing for access to the inmates in that core time which is two hours in the afternoons...”
NUM, Bathurst

A completely different view to this was expressed by the Nurse Unit Manager at the Long Bay Hospital (D Ward). She stated categorically that “custodial presence” would not be seen by the clinic staff “as a protection”.

Training

The majority (8) of the NUMs said that they had completed “particular training in dealing with aggression or challenging behaviour”. Six (6) said that they had participated in workshops provided by CHS. This is in stark contrast to the low percentage of interviewed Probation and Parole Officers, Managers of Programs, Governors and indeed custodial officers who reported that they had training in this area. 65

Local Violence Reduction Strategies

Only four (4) NUMs said they were “aware of any strategies at [their] centre to reduce the incidence of violence between inmates”.

Not surprisingly, the NUM in Goulburn, for example, made it quite clear that he was aware of the practice of segregating inmate groups into separate yards. He commented that this local policy had “reduced the level of violence a bit”. The NUMs at Mulawa and Oberon named “case management” as an effective strategy. The NUM at Kirkconnell observed that there was an attempt “to house inmates appropriately, there is a Koori hut, and older inmates are accommodated away from the young yobhos”.

65 Details are given in the sections of the report which summarise the outcomes of the consultations with these staff groups.
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Programs

Interestingly, only three (3) NUMs refer to the existence of programs for inmates as another strategy to reduce the level of violence. Again, this conforms with the perception of other staff who when describing violence reduction and prevention strategies also focus on the physical security aspects such as the existence of duress alarms and “rolling lock-ins and let-gos”.

Probation and Parole Officers also focus in this context on the physical security facets of their work environment such as their office lay-out and the introduction of duress alarms which might be indicative of an increasingly more difficult client group they have to supervise.

CHS Violence Reduction Strategies

When asked whether CHS itself has “strategies of its own to reduce violence against staff”, six (6) answered in the affirmative and three (3) in the negative. The strategies listed were the availability of duress alarms (2), not seeing inmates without them being accompanied by a custodial officer (2), reporting any observations which might be relevant in gauging an inmate’s behaviour to the Deputy Governor (1), training (2) and reduction of clinic waiting times (1).

The A/NUM at the Parramatta Correctional Centre said that the clinic staff at this centre made a “concerted effort to reduce waiting times” after a survey was conducted with inmates which showed that they considered timely access to the clinic as an issue. As a result of the survey, clinic times were changed. A second survey was conducted to ascertain whether the changed practices had the desired effect (August 2000 - June 2001). The a/NUM reported that the situation had improved markedly.

Richard Mathews, CEO of the Corrections Health Service, explained that the survey at Parramatta was part of an ongoing process of quality assurance and that all correctional centre clinics have to undertake such reviews to ensure their Australian Council on Health Care Standards (ACHS) accreditation as part of the Evaluation Quality Improvement Program (EQIP).
5.1.5 Probation and Parole Officers

Twenty-eight (28) Probation and Parole staff (16 female and 12 male) from seven (7) district offices were interviewed formally; of these, two (2) were District Managers, two (2) were Unit Leaders and two (2) administrative support staff.

"We have to acknowledge that Probation and Parole Officers deal with a population which is at risk of violence... Staff training must include modules about reading signs of risk so staff can develop protective behaviours."

Catriona McComish, Assistant Commissioner Probation and Parole

aggressive and/or violent" with an emphatic “yes”. Only two (2) officers answered in the negative and one (1) of those had only been in his position for four months.

Solving Difficult Situations

Thirteen (13) officers answered in the affirmative when they were asked whether they had been “involved in a particular difficult situation with clients since the beginning of this year?”

Of the thirteen, only six (6) said that they had “reported” these incidents. Three (3) stated that they reported the incident to their Unit Leader; one (1) actually pressed charges with the police and completed a formal incident report; one (1) officer (female) said she wrote an entry in the “incident book”. One (1) officer who facilitates group sessions in the attendance centre of the district office stated that the incident she was referring to involved a dispute between spouses in the waiting area and because there were children present, she notified DOCS and wrote “a lengthy case note”. As an interesting aside, she told that an officer from the local Area Health Service who was present at the time voiced his surprise that she did not file “a critical incident report” which he thought was warranted.

Training

Considering this significant experience of aggression towards them from their clients, it is of importance to note that only eight (8) of the 28 interviewed officers answered in the affirmative when asked whether they had “particular training for dealing with clients with challenging behaviour”; 17 said they had no specific training in this area. Three (3) answered the question with “yes and no” because
their training had taken place before they commenced working in the Probation and Parole Service.

Of those who answered in the affirmative, two (2) said they had "self defence training", only six (6) pointed to training which could be described as strategic communication but again it had been provided by agencies other than Probation and Parole. When there was training, in most cases it was referred to as "a long time ago".

Working with Clients from Non-English Speaking Backgrounds

With the increased attention to ethnic groups in some district offices, the role of bi-lingual and bi-cultural staff is also important. In informal discussions with staff at the Bankstown Probation and Parole Office, some staff voiced specific concerns: officers who share a cultural and ethnic background with a significant number of a particular office's clients, can be put under distinct pressure.

"Aggression happens frequently but manifested violence not that often."

Probation and Parole Unit leader with 10 years experience

For example, the Lebanese communities (both Christian and Muslim) are considered to be "tight knit communities" and officers who not only work but also live in these communities, might have difficulties "leaving their work behind". In addition, if an officer is a member of one of the smaller ethnic communities in the area, clients often have privacy concerns as they perceive the officers as the keepers of important community information similar to doctors and other professionals with access to personal information. This in turn creates added pressures on the officer.

Seven (7) officers said that "dealing with aggressive clients" was a "regular topic for discussion at team meetings". Only one of these mentioned that there was a regular "difficult client section" on the agenda.

Complex Case Load

Twelve (12) interviewed officers were adamant that "things had changed" since they first started in their jobs "as far as client aggression / violence is concerned". Eight (8) said they did not perceive any change. Fifteen (15) had been employed by Probation and Parole for longer than five (5) years, eleven (11) for ten (10) years and longer.
The changes were described by eight (8) officers as being for the worse:

"[Aggression] ...has increased dramatically mainly because of drugs and mental health issues." (Goulburn)

"...We are having a harder core of people; before when you had 60 clients, about 40 of them were quite 'easy'; now when you have 60 clients, it's 60 'difficult' ones..." (Wollongong)

"I think there is a lot more anger in younger clients..." (Bankstown)

One (1) officer who has been in the Service for 16 years pointed out that the "higher pressures on clients" contribute to an increase in their aggression: "There are much more demands made on clients - for example, the new rules of Centrelink put more stress on them; their benefits get cut etc..."

Knowledge of Departmental Violence Reduction Strategies

Ten (10) officers answered in the affirmative when asked whether they had a "sense that there are Departmental strategies in place to reduce the level of violence in the Probation and Parole area". Of these, only five (5) made reference to specific procedures with regard to "violence reduction"; they mentioned for example, the use of mobile phones, duress alarms and the new home visits and fieldwork procedures which had just been issued at the time of the interviews for this report.

To the question "are there any strategies at this office to reduce the potential for violence and aggression by clients?", fifteen (15) officers answered in the affirmative and six (6) in the negative.

"We discuss it - talk about respecting clients and listening to their problems and speaking to them as adults, follow through with things and respond to things".

Probation and Parole Officer

Of those who stated that they were aware of such strategies, eleven (11) named physical strategies such as office layout, visibility of meeting rooms, and duress alarms.

Only two officers (2) - both from the same office - point to strategies which acknowledge that the professionalism of officers can contribute to reducing the potential for violence and aggression, for example - "We are good with the pre-sentence reports so the referrals are good".
Gender Differences

Twenty-three (23) officers (9 male and 14 female) said that their male and female clients “express aggression / violence differently”. The rest (5) of the interviewed officers did not offer an opinion on the matter.

The responses of nine (9) of the fourteen (14) female officers can be summarised as “women are more verbal and men can be physically intimidating and threatening” and “women tend to physically internalise and self-abuse; guys externalise more and thump somebody”.

Three (3) female officers made the point that “women are catching up ...and are becoming more threatening”. One (1) female officer took a different tack: “I think men are more open and honest about it; women are unpredictable and very vicious”.

Six (6) of the nine (9) male officers who answered in the affirmative concur with the nine (9) female officers who stated that generally women tend to be more “verbal” and men tend to express their aggression in a “physical” manner.

Program Facilitators

Nine (9) officers said that in the provision of group programs, the gender of a facilitator “mattered”; eight (8) officers did not believe that was the case.

The supporting arguments for both points of view varied significantly. Some officers believed that only the professional expertise of the facilitator was important, not the gender as such. There was an acknowledgement that whether the facilitator was male or female may “have an impact with certain cultural groups in the community”.

5.1.6 Correctional Officers

Formal interviews were conducted with 39 (24 male and 15 female) Correctional Officers in ten (10) correctional centres. Twenty-one (21) of these officers had been working in correctional centres for more than ten (10) years; seven (7) had an employment history with the Department of less than two (2) years.
As the majority of interviewed officers had been employed by the Department for a significant amount of time, it is worth noting that eighteen (18) said that as far as the incidence of inmate aggression and violence is concerned “things have changed” since they first started their job. Five (5) officers stated that the situation had improved and four (4) of these credited the introduction of case management for this. Nine (9) officers said that there had been a change for the “worse” and one claimed that case management was the reason for this.

**Training Needs**

To the question “have you had any training in the areas of violence prevention, strategic communication or dealing with aggression”, eleven (11) officers answered in the affirmative but twenty-four (24) said they had no training in this area at all. It is interesting to note that of the officers who said that they had received training, only three (3) could point to a specific training module which dealt with conflict resolution in the broadest sense (eg, as part of the Young Adult Offenders Course), the Seniors Course and the Graduate Certificate in Management. One (1) officer had just completed the new training program for the HRMU; one (1) officer participated in on-the-job-training for staff at the Special Care Unit; and one (1) officer had completed the Risk Management Course.

**Personal Safety at Stake**

Fifteen (15) of the interviewed officers said that they “feel their personal safety was jeopardised” while at work. Nineteen (19) officers did not feel this way.

"The reports are too complicated. They need to keep it more simple. It can be an absolute shemozzle. The paper work is huge and the Department has a tendency to regulate problems not manage them. They are not looking at what is the cause of the problems."

*Male officer, Senior*

Twenty-three (23) officers said that they had “been personally involved in a violent incident with an inmate”; twelve (12) answered in the negative. A closer look at these incidents reveals that four (4) officers reported that they were physically assaulted; nine (9) officers said they were at the recipient end of violence when they
had to intervene when inmates were fighting or when they had to use force in situations when an inmate had to be given medication or removed from /moved to a particular cell. All of the officers who had been involved in an incident said that an official report ensued.

**Reporting Requirements**

Nineteen (19) of the interviewed officers stated that they had to complete an official incident report in the first six months of 2001.

When asked for their comments on the current reporting process, ten (10) officers said the process was too cumbersome and involved “too much paperwork”; nineteen (19) officers offered the opinion that the processes were adequate but a few also believed that the processes were a “hit over the top”. Interestingly enough, eight (8) officers thought that the reports were not achieving a desired result as, to sum it up, “the punishments [for the inmates] are not harsh and consistent enough”. Three (3) bemoaned the fact that they did not get any ‘feed back’ once they had supplied a report.

**Reasons Behind the Violence**

When asked what they thought were the reasons for these incidents, only two common themes seemed to emerge: “mental health issues” (6 officers) and “inmates not getting their own way” (4 officers).

Other explanations range from “personality clashes” to “just disrespect for the law and authority”. Only five (5) officers made an attempt in their answer to place the aggressive action of an inmate in a particular situation which might be related to being imprisoned: “frustration”, “was probably detoxing”, “it’s a build up - their problem might not have been dealt with”, “inmates taking out frustration”, and “being shown up in front of another inmate”. When the question was asked in a more open-ended fashion (“what do you see as the main causes of violence between inmates”), rather than in relation to specific incidents officers have experienced or witnessed, they point to a broad range of reasons. Fourteen (14) officers named drugs and related issues such as detoxing as a main reason for aggression and violence; the same

*When I see inmates fighting, I pull the one who is on top away. But of course, depending on the situation, I’d call for help. When there are 25 inmates at each other, I’d definitely call for help.*

Male officer, First Class
number (14) pointed to “stand-over tactics” for property and drugs as another main cause for incidents between inmates.

Nine (9) officers cited “race issues” as another major reason for conflict; only five (5) saw inmates’ mental health status as a source of violence and aggression; five (5) officers named “intolerance and getting on each others’ nerves” and two (2) made the link to “lack of space and overcrowding”. Three (3) officers blamed “rivalry for dominance” as a reason and the same number (3) said “debts were a major factor”. Two (2) officers mentioned “grudges from the outside”, “boredom”, “gambling” and “peer pressure”. “Poor coping and social skills”, “frustration”, “wrong mixing of classes”, “bad attitude”, “medication”, “stress” and “it’s in their nature” were additional explanations.

**Suggested Actions**

The answers to the question about how the intel process works at their centre varied significantly. Six (6) officers made the point that the process was “working well”; two (2) officers said they did not know who the intel officer was at their centre; seven (7) officers answered the question with “don’t know”.

The question “what do you think should be done to reduce the level of violence in gaol” brought only thirteen (13) answers from the thirty-nine (39) officers interviewed. Only four (4) officers thought that “giving something to inmates” could have a positive effect: “they need more programs - they have too much time to just sit around” and “give them work - simple as that”, “...and give them something to do” and “there are ... no activities to get the aggression out”. Three (3) officers expressed the opinion that “everything that could be done is done”; only one (1) officer thought that some “preventative measure” could be helpful: “if you see or hear anything you try and prevent it and resolve the situation.”

The above answers have to be seen in the context that all responding officers except one were talking only about the situation in their particular correctional centre. Three (3) officers offered their own particular “solution” for the whole of the gaol system: “maybe look at their criminal history and house them accordingly”, “more gaols, more placement options” and “open more gaols so it’s not so crowded”.
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Only 28 of the interviewed officers responded to the question whether they "play a part in facilitating any anti-violence and/or anger management programs" at their centre. Twenty-four (24) answered in the negative and two (2) in the affirmative. The two who answered in the affirmative do not - in their own opinion - facilitate or participate in any formal sense: "Because there is no programs, I get involved and help inmates resolve issues..." and "referring inmates as part of program pathway and I have counselled inmates as to their attitudes".

"When I was still working in the wings, I would have a wing meeting with the inmates every Sunday night where any issue could be raised. I fixed what I could and passed the rest on to the Area Manager. I have no idea why this practice stopped because I think it worked really well."
Female Officer, Senior

In the case of the officers who said they play no part, some of them (6) made the distinction between being formally involved and playing some role in this regard; for example: "just through case management", "only a bit of case management", "play a role in terms of recommendations for referral" and "only recommend that an inmate undertakes a program".

Awareness of Operational Strategies

As a general observation, the interviews with the 39 prison officers gave the impression that they were not particularly interested in grappling with their role as case officers or participants in case management or in working towards a common goal as stated in the Department's corporate and strategic plans and local business plans.

The answers to two following questions are relevant in this regard - "Are you aware of any operational strategies in place to reduce the incidence of violence between inmates at your centre?" and "Are you aware of any departmental or centre strategies to reduce the incidence of violence from inmates against staff?".

While eighteen (18) officers answered in the affirmative and seventeen (17) in the negative to the first question, the majority (26) answered the second question in the negative and only nine (9) in the affirmative.

The details of the individual answers provide further insights. As far as "local operational strategies" are concerned, of those officers (18) who answered that they
had knowledge of such strategies, only ten (10) could point to specific activities they saw as a strategy to reduce the incidence of violence between inmates: four (4) officers said that case management was such a strategy, three (3) thought that “courses” for inmates help, one (1) officer lauded the availability of “very fast back-up - SERT”, another officer pointed to surveillance cameras as a strategy and one (1) officer nominated “management plans for violent inmates” as a strategy.

Nine (9) officers claimed they were aware of some of the “departmental or centre strategies to reduce the incidence of violence from inmates against staff”. Five (5) of these officers supplied an answer which demonstrated that they had an understanding of the context of their work:

“We have done a lot - there is separation and we address the cultural issues and because of the separation of the different groups, there is not so much violence and racial tension any more.” (Emu Plains)

“The biggest tool is case management and officers are much more interactive with inmates - there are anger management courses for inmates...” (John Morony 1)

“There are counselling sessions and psychologists talk to inmates...” (MRRC)

“Not enough is being done and there are problems with a mixture of cultures and issues with individual inmates are not addressed...” (Tamworth)

“There are violence prevention programs but they can’t be done here because inmates are here for such a short time...” (Tamworth)

**Knowledge of the Workplace**

Nine (9) officers said that “violence reduction strategies and issues surrounding violence in [their] centre are discussed at staff meetings”. However, it is important to note that all of these nine officers said that these discussions only occurred “after” an incident had occurred or specific intel might be available.

“We have to be careful that in implementing core programs we do not overlook the need to keep inmates occupied. A loss of activities can mean a higher rate of violence.”

John Klok, Regional Commander, Metropolitan Region

The majority of officers identified particular hotspots for violence between inmates in their centre (28) and particular times when violence between inmates was more likely to occur (25). A range of locations within centres were identified with the common theme being “anywhere
where there are no officers present”. Officers working in the same gaols tended to agree on which areas they saw as the most vulnerable, for example in the showers or in the yards. The same is true as far as the answers about a “particular time” are concerned. Again, the common understanding seems to be that it is more likely to occur at a time when there are no officers present.

5.2 Evidence Based Programming

In August 1998, the Department introduced an inmate services and program planning initiative as an essential part of the Regions’ business planning processes. A correctional centre Inmate Services and Programs Plan (ISPP) was to ensure that

“inmate services delivered at a centre reflect departmental priorities, statewide strategies and the particular inmate needs profile at the centre ... The objective is to devolve responsibility for the planning and implementation of inmate management and program services to the correctional centre level with expert input and supervision from the statewide program areas ensuring the corporate goals are met within each correctional centre plan.”

At the core of inmate services and program planning was to be a strong link between the needs of the specific inmate population at a particular centre, a definite rationale explaining why a certain program was to be given priority and the requirement to point to evidence that all programs included in the plan were proven to be effective. The ISPPs were to ensure that contemporary approaches to offender management were adopted with the major focus on “addressing offending behaviour” to avoid re-offending. A further requirement stipulated by the Assistant Commissioner Inmate Management in line with current departmental policy initiatives with regard to throughcare, was to include wherever possible staff of the Probation and Parole Service (PPS) and Corrective Services Industries (CSI) in the ISP planning process.

This new planning initiative was further progressed in 2000/2001, when the

---

66 Memorandum from Assistant Commissioner Inmate Management to Regional Commanders, Managers of Programs, Inmate Management Directors and Managers, 7th August 1998

67 The “Best Practice Framework for Program Intervention” (a review of the ‘What-Works’ literature, by Caruana, R.), May 1998 and later an “Interim Guides to Correctional Centre Programming for Program Managers” (October 2000) were among the resources provided to Managers of Programs and Inmate Services and Program staff to help with their planning activities.
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Departmental Review Committee of Inmate Services and Programs 68 was given the task inter alia to

"recommend structures that will ensure the appropriate level of services and programs to ensure better rehabilitation outcomes for inmates and the community" 69

Since the relatively high number of violent and aggressive incidents between inmates is of major concern and since one of the corporate guarantees of service is to "adequately meet the security, safety and welfare needs of correctional centre inmates" 70, it is to be expected that the Inmate Services and Program Plans take into account offenders' history of violent behaviours and provide opportunities for program participation to learn appropriate and acceptable behaviour.

5.2.1 Violence Reduction in Inmate Services And Program Plans

For this report, a review of all Inmate Services and Program Plans received by the Inmate Management Division for the 2001/2002 financial year was undertaken with particular attention to the inclusion of programs which deal with violence reduction and prevention and/or anger management. 71

As the specific planning process for inmate services and programs is still relatively new 72, it is not surprising that the provided ISPPs, though following a prescribed template, vary in detail and quality.

---

68 The Review Committee chaired by the Director, Inmate Services and Programs comprised representatives from the Department of Corrective Services, Corrections Health Service, Premier's Department, Department of Juvenile Justice, Aboriginal Justice Advisory Council and the University of Sydney.

69 Terms of Reference for the Review

70 Corporate Plan 2001 - 2004, New South Wales Department of Corrective Services, p4

71 All but three correctional centres supplied their ISPPs within the allocated deadline.

72 The 2001/2002 financial year is the second ISPP budget and planning cycle
The Director of Strategy and Planning who had carriage for the ISP planning process for 2001/2002 observed that there were "marked improvements in comparison to last year" as "the majority show a greater connection between the inmate profile of the individual centres and planned program provision".

Despite this general improvement, it is still difficult to ascertain a definite connection between programs dealing with issues of violence and/or anger and the specific needs of a group of inmates with shared characteristics and risks. While in most ISPPs such a link is implied, it is also difficult to discern whether a prioritising process was applied which led to the inclusion of particular programs dealing with issues of violence and anger particular when the inmate profile section of the plan alluded to violence being a characteristic. Missing as well is a differentiation between violent behaviour which offenders manifest during their time in custody and violence as part of a history of criminal behaviour.

5.2.2 Inmate Services and Program Planning in Centres with High Levels of Inmate Violence

According to the Department’s statistics documenting incidents of violence between inmates, the following correctional centres and/or correctional centre areas featured predominantly during the period reviewed for this report:

Metropolitan Reception and Remand Centre (MRRC), Tamworth, Parklea (maximum security area), Cessnock (Area 3 - maximum security), Mulawa, Long Bay Hospital / Metropolitan Medical Transient Centre (MMTC), Broken Hill, Malabar Special Programs Centre (MSPC) (Area 4 - specifically 7 wing) and Goulburn Correctional Centre.

Generally speaking, a review of the ISPPs for these centres supports the observation that the expressed link between the needs of particular offender groups (eg, violent offenders) and prioritised evidence-based program provision is tentative at best and non-existent at worse.

---

73 Letter to Managers of Programs, August/September 2001

74 At the time of this report, the ISPP for the Mulawa Correctional Centre had not been submitted.
Metropolitan Reception and Remand Centre

The MRRC is the largest remand facility for men in NSW. Its ISPP notes that “We don’t discuss violence reduction strategies regularly at executive meetings but in our business plan it says that our ISPP is to focus on violence reduction.”

Charles MacKay, Manager of Programs, MRRC

issues inherent to a remand facility when inmates are at their most vulnerable and uncertain time of incarceration.

The challenges and constraints within which the plan should be appraised refer to the overriding priorities of intake screening, risk intervention and classification. The plan notes stress management and anger management, the Life Management Program (Stage 2), addiction programs, inmate leisure activities, hobbies and creative arts in addition to legal literacy programs and Law Library Services as specific strategies to deal with “risk to others”.

Tamworth Correctional Centre

The Tamworth ISPP’s detailed inmate profile includes a reference to “60 percent” of the local gaol population “being [incarcerated] for violence-associated crimes or high levels of impulsivity”.76

No programs for this offender group are specified in the plan. This is not surprising because of the “high turn-over and short length of stay of inmates,” which dictates that a major emphasis must be on screening, assessment and referral. The ISPP indeed supports this.

At the same time, it is also not surprising that the incidence of violence between inmates in Tamworth is relatively high when the reality of the structured day is presented. For example, over a considerable time and due to staff shortages, inmates at Tamworth have had access to the oval only about five times per month. Inmates

76 Tamworth ISPP, p 1
76 Ibid p3
share a small confined area for most of their time out of cell and this lack of physical outlet contributes to stress and aggression.

**Parklea Correctional Centre**

The ISPP for Parklea in its introduction identifies 15 characteristics in the inmate profile. The thirteenth of these characteristics refers to “many inmates [who] demonstrate high levels of impulsivity and violence”. The plan also notes that “remand [inmates] are a needs-intensive population, highly transient and protection remand [inmates] even more so”.

The Parklea ISPP states as one of its objectives “to increase inmates’ ability to self manage violent and impulsive behaviour...” but only in the context of “problems with relationships ... difficulty managing anger ... no developed concepts of self analysis or reflection which needs to breakdown of relationships and further criminal behaviour...”. An “anger management”, “relationships”, “parenting program for fathers” and “personal effectiveness program” are to be provided in group sessions. There is no other reference to violence prevention / reduction in the plan and there seems to be a confusion between programs catering to the needs of offenders with a history of violence and needs of offenders who have difficulty managing their impulsive behaviour and / or their anger.

**Malabar Special Programs Centre**

The ISPP for the Malabar Special Programs Centre deals with a variety of therapeutic programs. There have been serious incidents of inmate-on-inmate violence in the last few months in area 4 and particularly in 7 Wing. The section of the ISPP which deals with 7 Wing makes it clear that among other priority considerations, the needs of “large numbers of inmates” who are in custody for probably (as still unsentenced) “violent and drug related offences” must be met not

---

77 Shrs x 6 weeks, 7x p/a in all areas of the centre

78 The MSPC houses the Life Styles Unit, the Acute Crisis Management Unit, the Kevin Waller Unit, the Sex Offenders Program and the Malabar Art Unit.
the least by "increase [of] meaningful structured activities because of absence of industries and minimal access to activities area".

The plan is astute in its description of "identified needs" and detailed in its "objectives" but loses its punch when outlining intended program strategies. This is understandable when the circumstances with regard to staff shortages, access to program areas and physical conditions in this part of the MSPC are taken into account. The plan for 7 Wing is nothing but realistic because in the "performance criteria" column, for example, no attempt is evident that a link is made between program outcomes and reduction of violent incidents.

**Broken Hill Correctional Centre**

The "inmate profile" section of the Broken Hill ISPP 79 makes reference to "many inmates [who] demonstrate high levels of impulsivity and violence". Under the heading "interpersonal / self management skills", the plan proposes that "Anger Management Programs" and "Violence Reduction Programs" are to be provided as a matter of priority.

Five of the twelve pages of the plan are dedicated to programming for female inmates which includes an "anger management program" 80. The proposed "anger management program" for men is to be conducted by the AOD worker "as required on a cyclic basis". It appears that "anger management" for male inmates is the only program at Broken Hill which is "to increase inmates' ability to self-manage violent and impulsive behaviour". The inmate profile section of the plan alludes to "many inmates who demonstrate high levels of impulsivity and violence" but the plan does not offer any program details based on clear objectives.

**Metropolitan Medical Transient Centre**

The ISPP for the Metropolitan Medical Transient Centre (MMTC) mentions 23 "inmate target groups" for whom "individual needs" have to be taken into account. Eleventh on this list are "violent offenders". "Inmates who have been identified as

---

79 The Broken Hill Correctional Centre was without a Manager of Programs for the current ISPP planning phase.

80 to be offered 2hrs p/w for 6 weeks, 4 x p/a
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management challenges / difficulties in other centres" and are placed at the MMTC take 17th position on the "target group" list. The plan notes that "to date no budget has been allocated for the provision of programs and services in the MMTC/LBH ... with the exception of AEVTI funding".

By including the "budgetary needs of AEVTI" with regard to areas such as "inmate education fees", "inmate education activities" and "inmate leisure activities", the existence of some programs is implied but they are not linked to the "inmate target groups" and "inmate profile" detailed earlier in the plan. Again, this does not seem surprising due to the "diverse transient inmate population housed in the centre" combined with "frequent lock-downs" as a result of "staff shortages" which make the implementation of consistent effective program interventions difficult to say the least.

**Cessnock Correctional Centre**

The introduction of ISPP for Cessnock makes the point that there are "44 percent of inmates [who have been] convicted of violent offences". In the self management skills summary of the plan, several programs are listed to meet the needs of these offenders. As part of the Phoenix (intensive AOD) Program, inmates in the designated drug-free wing at Cessnock participate in three workshops dealing with alternatives to violence. Also proposed are anger management sessions81 and an Alcohol and Violence Program for Aboriginal offenders is scheduled as well82.

"Like most correctional centres, custodial staff shortages result in frequent unplanned lock-downs" which - so the ISPP states - "disrupts the delivery of programs...". The "limited access [for inmates] to the oval" is attributed to the "frequent staff shortages" as well.

---

81 2hrs p/w for 5 weeks, 9x p/a
82 2hrs p/w for 6 weeks, 4 x p/a
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Goulburn Correctional Centre

The focus of the Goulburn ISPP includes “assessment of inmates” 83 to facilitate among other things the “identification of inmates who meet the criteria for the violence prevention program”. 84

Further, in the “identified needs” category “offending behaviour”, the objective is described as “identification of problematic behaviour” so that “referral to an appropriate discipline [can be facilitated] to allow inappropriate behaviour to be addressed”. 85 The designated ‘target group’ for this intervention is “inmates presenting as management concerns” and who are to be “referred to appropriate programs”. 86 The exact nature of these “appropriate programs” is not identified and the nature of “management concerns” is not put within the context of the specific environmental conditions of the Goulburn Correctional Centre.

“The gaol can be tense for staff and inmates... The wide range of programs we deliver are to reduce violence... Priority is to move perpetrators on, not the victims.”
Alex Apostolatis, Manager of Programs, Cessnock

More detailed is the program provision for those inmates identified as having “difficulty in resolving conflict” and who are offered six (6) conflict resolution programs per annum. As the performance criteria for this category include a “reduction of conflict incidents” 87, a connection between the high number of violent incidents between inmates and the need for violence prevention / reduction programs seems to be implied but is again not developed within the context of the highly volatile situation in certain sections of the Goulburn Correctional Centre.

There is only a cursory reference in the “inmate profile” section of the ISPP to the management by separation applied at Goulburn to curtail violence: “there are currently nine (9) groups or classes of inmates that must be kept separate to ensure

84 Ibid p 10
85 Ibid
86 Ibid p 13
87 Ibid p 14
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duty of care”. 88 This is noteworthy because this situation has significant implications for the intensity and frequency of programs and services provision at this correctional centre. 89

5.3 Structured Day

A centre piece of inmate management in NSW correctional centres is what is called the “structured day”. It was formally introduced in 1992 in an acknowledgement that case management and the smooth running of a correctional centre are enhanced by adhering to a prescribed institutional time table for inmates which covers for example, time out of cell, time on the oval and access to Inmate Services and Program staff.

While the focus of this “structured day” is to be on meeting the needs of inmates, a significant number of staff observed that in the complex reality of the day-to-day gaol life, the focus is shifted to the needs of staff. Since access to programs and services for inmates is dependent on the availability of custodial staff, the inmates’ structured day is therefore determined by whether or not custodial posts are filled rather than the allocation of duties to custodial officers based on inmate needs.

To complicate matters further, more often than not, custodial officers use the term in an altogether different context. Any time for them “away from inmates” for a period of training and development or a staff meeting, for example, they consider as part of their “structured day”. Brian Kelly, General Manager of the MRRC pointed out that it would be preferable if these activities would be categorised differently.

"When scheduling inmates for activities we can try and break through the segregation. We can say 'if you mix with the others, you can have more time in activities' and that can work as a carrot"

Peter Kay, Manager of Programs, Goulburn

86 89 Ibid p 2

There is another group of inmates who need to deal with violence issues. Male inmates who are subject to AVOs and DVOs have access to parenting programs (“Hey Dad” - 10x2hrs, twice p/a) and a domestic violence program (12 sessions x 2hrs x 3 p/a), ISPP p 15
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Let-go times in Areas A and B at Goulburn Correctional Centre vary depending on whether the inmates are workers or not. A worker in 1 Unit, for example is let-go at 6:30am and locked in at 4:00pm. Workers in other units are let-go at 6:00am and locked in at 4:00pm. Non-workers are let-go at 8:00 am and locked in again at 4:00pm.

The Centre is locked down once a month for a search and locked down for a four hour period once a month to facilitate a staff meeting.

5.3.1 Lock-downs and Time Out of Cells

Most activities which custodial officers engage in as part of their “structured day” result in complete or partial lock-downs of correctional centres. Lock-downs occur regularly or irregularly and in addition to the routine overnight lock-ins or lock-ins during the lunch period. These routine lock-ins may vary from correctional centre to correctional centre and even from wing to wing within a centre. Regular lock-downs occur for staff and union meetings, staff training sessions and the monthly centre searches.

Some or all of these lock-downs are scheduled in each centre each month. Some centres either cannot or do not lock inmates in cells and but still facilitate meetings and searches.

The frequency of lock-downs was regarded by many inmates and officers alike as a significant contributor to the frustration of inmates that could possibly result in violence.

For this report the project team have compared the reporting of lock-downs in the running sheets for September 2000 and September 2001. In September 2000 there were 71 occasions on which a centre was either partially or fully locked-down for varying periods of time. This had increased to 95 occasions in September 2001.90

As these lock-downs have a marked effect on access to programs, services and work as well as on the general well-being of inmates, a review of the structured day practices is advisable. At the same time it is acknowledged that a change to the structured day as currently implemented would have significant industrial

90 See appendix 7, table 1
repercussions because longer time out of cells (e.g., from 7:00 am to 6:00 pm) would require additional shift requirements and associated resources.

**Average Daily Time Out of Cells**

The Department must report inmates' average daily time out of cells as a correctional indicator to the Productivity Commission. This figure is determined on the basis of daily lock-in times provided by Governors, together with the number of regular and irregular lock-downs as submitted to the Duty Officer. The average daily time out of cells has been recorded in this manner for the last three financial years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Out of Cells: MRRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inmates in Darcy at the MRRC are let-go at 9:00 am and return to their cells at 3:30 pm for the remainder of the day. Inmates in all other areas of the MRRC are let-go at 8:30 am and returned to their cells at 3:30 pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Tuesday is staff training day. On these days the inmates are locked in their cells all day except for a period of two hours for exercise. Every Friday, inmates are locked into cells for an extra hour to facilitate the staff structured day. Monthly POVB meetings are also scheduled, requiring inmates to be locked in cells for an extra hour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth noting that the calculation of the average is derived from the time inmates are out of their cells which does not necessarily mean time out of their wing or specific unit. This has implications for areas such as the June Baker Unit for women in Grafton which is rarely locked down but the inmates there are frequently confined to the wing. Whilst one would presume this to be preferable to being locked in cells, significant loss of access to programs and services still occurs because the women cannot move between their unit and the designated ISP areas.

For the 2000/2001 financial year, the average daily time out of cells was calculated as 11.5 hours. This figure represented a slight rise compared to the previous two years.91

During the consultations for this report, the project team gained the impression from Governors, staff and inmates that lock-downs are becoming more common as

---

91 See appendix 7, table 2
staff shortages are becoming more critical. In an effort to lessen the impact on the inmates, many centres are confining inmates to wings or landings rather than locking them in their cells depending on the layout of the centre. This practice may not necessarily be reported to the Duty Officer as a lock-down.

The project team spent time in 14 correctional centres interviewing staff and inmates on site. During these 14 centre visits, the project team was present for seven partial or full lock-downs. Of these seven lock-downs, three were not recorded on the daily running sheet.

During the visits the project team also noted early lock-ins and late let-gos which were not necessarily recorded in the running sheets. The team frequently observed that the let-go of inmates after lunch was delayed for example. These extended periods in cells were attributed to staff shortages due to escort duties or due to an extension of a staff meeting. More often than not, this extra time in cells was not noted on the running sheet.

### Time Out of Cells: Mulawa

Lock-in and let-go times at Mulawa vary from area to area, reflecting the complexity of the centre. Women are generally let-go at 6:30 am and locked in at 7:30 pm.

Residents in the Annex, the Induction Unit and the Mum Shirl Unit (MSU) are let-go at 8:00 am. Inmates at the Induction Unit and the MSU are locked in during lunch for 1.5 and 2 hours respectively.

The monthly staff meetings result in inmates being locked in for three hours, whilst the monthly search results in a six hour lock-in.

### Challenges and Constraints

Even a cursory review of the Inmate Services and Program Plans (ISPPs) submitted for this financial year clearly indicates that in developing their programming schedules, Managers of Programs in correctional centres must do so within a context where many external circumstances outside their managerial control determine the actual implementation of this program.

A sample of ISPPs gives an indication that complete and partial lock-downs as a result of staff shortages in particular areas of correctional centres have a significant influence over the access level for inmates to programs and services.
Under the heading “Challenges and Constraints”, the Goulburn ISPP points out that “custodial staff shortages result in frequent unplanned lock-downs in all areas” and that “two scheduled lock-downs per month reduce time available to access inmate and limited access time in all areas”.

The Tamworth ISPP describes the situation in a similar vein - “custodial staff shortages generally affect the daily running of the centre” and “one position short results in lock-downs of the centre and late let-go (10am); [in a situation of] more than one position short, the lock-down is more severe and any movements are severely restricted”.

The ISPP for the MMTC also discusses limited access of non-custodial staff to inmates - “shortage of custodial officers, resulting in areas partially or completely locked-down”. In addition, this ISPP points to the fact that “the different categories of inmates housed in the centre ... prohibits association ... [and] rostering of different inmate groups’ access to identified ISP Programs Area ... limits time spent by staff with inmates [which is] compounded by frequency of lock-downs in wing locations due to custodial staff shortages...”.

The Parklea ISPP does not provide a different picture either: “There is no identified lock-down day scheduled in Parklea [but] consistent with other correctional centres, there are often staff shortages which result in lock-downs in areas without advance notice. When the allocation of overtime is used up, units are shut down on a rotational basis.”

And the Cessnock ISPP joins the chorus - “like most correctional centres, custodial staff shortages result in frequent unplanned lock-downs. This disrupts the delivery of programs, particularly in areas 1 and 2 where the bulk of the developmental programs are located...the frequent staff shortages have also limited the access that inmates have to the oval”.
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Louise (not her real name) is a full-time student at Mulawa. In addition she is carrying out some clerical duties. She is living in Teresa, a wing in the Wyndana area.

Louise said let-go in Teresa “usually happens around 6:45 in the morning, although sometimes the officers will just do a head check at 6:30, then leave us in our cells until 7:15.” She says the wing has to be vacated by 7:30 when everybody has to go to their work or education location. They return after work and in normal circumstances are locked into the wing briefly for a muster at about 2:30pm. Women in Teresa are locked into their wing at 5:00 pm and then locked into their cells for the night at 7:30pm.

When asked to talk about any lock-downs that occurred in the last 10 days or so, she thought that the previous Friday she (along with all the other women in Mulawa) had been locked into their cells at 2:00 pm about ½ hour before the usual muster. This lock-down lasted for the rest of the day. On this occasion, the residents of Teresa were given a meal at 5:00 pm which is not usually the case as the women in Teresa cook their own meals. Louise is a vegetarian and she said no vegetarian meals were available for her. Medication, which is normally administered between 6:30pm and 7:00pm (before evening lock-in), was not received by Louise on this Friday until 11:00 pm. Louise thought that staff shortages were the reason for this lock-down.

On Tuesday following this particular Friday, so Louise remembered, the women in Teresa were locked in at 4:00pm. Most often no warning is given to inmates but on this occasion the women were given a 30 minutes notice. This still caused problems as 17 women had to then cool their dinner within these 30 minutes. Louise said when this happens there is no time to ring family and the mail is not given out. Louise said she did not know the reason for this particular lock-down.

The next day, on Wednesday, Louise remembered that there was a lock-down in the middle of the day because of a staff meeting. Louise said that this caused her to miss out on classes and she also lost money as she could not go to work. While the women do not lose their wages as a result of a lock-down, Louise regretted that “you do lose the overtime money”.

Louise made it clear that she thought that the lock-downs were causing tensions in the centre to rise, and that there were more fights and self-harms than when there were not so many lock-downs. She emphasised that it was
particularly hard for the women who did not have a TV or radio, or for those who could not or did not read. She mentioned that she was aware of some incidents which occurred during the week and which she believed were directly related to the lock-downs. She said one woman for example "trashed her cell", another tried to escape and at least one woman "slashed-up".

One of the hardest things about lock-downs, Louise said, was that the women had no idea when they were going to happen - "if you had time to prepare you could get some homework organised, maybe something to read or make your phone calls". Louise also thought the difficulties of lock-downs were exacerbated because the staff seemed unable to let the women know how long it would last.

When comparing Louise's recount with the official running sheets, the following picture emerges: Mulawa was locked down in the first instance (Friday) from 2:30 pm because of staff sick-leave. The second lock-down on Tuesday was recorded on the running sheet as having commenced at 3:30 pm in Teresa, Willet and Conlon. Staff shortages and a hospital escort were given as the reasons. The lock-down of the wing in the middle of the day on Wednesday was not recorded on the running sheet. This may be because the women were locked into the wing and not cells, or perhaps Louise got the day wrong.
5.4 Inmate Activities

From the daily synopsis and the related analyses of incidence data by the Research and Statistics Unit, it is clear that there are particular hot spots for violence. Centres which comprise old buildings and out-dated facilities and/or accommodate remandees, inmates in transit or other inmate groups who may be volatile due to their specific mental health needs, tend to feature predominantly as far as the number of incidents between inmates are concerned. Despite the difficulties resulting from this, most senior executives in these correctional centres are committed to implementing management strategies which give support to the inmates' structured day and so counteract boredom and frustration.

"When you do things and keep the guys busy, it is easy for Management to see the benefit in having activities officers. Incidents go down. But if you don’t do your job well, it’s not surprising that you get ‘stripped’ because Management doesn’t see the benefit of having activities officers as a priority when they are short of staff generally in all areas."

Lennox Peters, Activities Office, Parramatta CC

Parramatta Correctional Centre

The Parramatta Correctional Centre seems to have found an effective approach to counteracting some of the inmates’ boredom and frustration. In this centre two activities officers can carry out their duties with as few interruptions as realistically possible. This means, activities officers’ posts are only ‘stripped’ when absolutely necessary. The Governor of Parramatta was adamant that even in the context of staff shortages he would ensure that inmates at his centre have regular access to physical activities on the oval and in the yards. “Since February this year”, says one of the activities officers at the Parramatta Correctional Centre, “we don’t get stripped that often - maybe once a week or once a fortnight which is quite different to what happened before”.

It has been put to the project team that this was not so difficult to do at Parramatta because the remand inmates in this centre tend to be “more settled” compared with other remand populations. This in turn is considered due to a process by which remand inmates at the MRRC are selected for transfer to Parramatta.

Whatever the case may be, this management decision appears to have had multiple effects. On the one hand, the activities officers are delighted that they have opportunities to develop a range of endeavours with minimum interruptions. On the other hand, inmates who have only limited access to employment can get involved...
in structured leisure activities which provide the physical outlet craved by young men.

No wonder, the Activities Officers at this centre are brimming with enthusiasm and talk animatedly about their projects which includes a “revamp of the oval” (“we have just finished a walking track and are working on some posters we’ll put up for a work-out circuit”).

**Goulburn Correctional Centre**

The Officer in charge of the Activities Officers’ team in Goulburn concurs with his colleagues at Parramatta Correctional Centre. As in Parramatta, in Goulburn the activities officers’ posts are also only rarely stripped. This is at the direction of the Governor.

In Goulburn, the timetable for the oval, for example, is “quite difficult” according to the Activities Officer in charge because there are so many groups to consider which cannot associate with each other. 92 ‘Activities’ at this Centre is open 7 days per week and is only closed for POVB meetings, staff meetings and institutional searches when the whole gaol is locked down anyway. The Activities Officers are adamant that there is a direct link between activities and violence reduction.

**Activities Working Party**

There is an understanding across the Department that activities as part of the inmates’ structured day are an important tool to ensure that the corporate goal which commits the Department to “safe and humane containment” is upheld. It is no coincidence that a Working Party93 was formed to “review provisions for the

92 See appendix 8: Goulburn Correctional Centre Activities Timetable (Events 2001, Main Gaol)

93 This Working Party was formed by the Assistant Commissioner Inmate Management in 1999 and comprises representatives from the Department’s Inmate Services and Development Area (in particular AEVTI which provides a project officer to the WP) and Corrections Health Service.
organisation and conduct of recreation and activities programs”. The major impetus for the establishment of this working party came from a report of the Nurse Manager, Primary Health Care of CHS who was concerned about the “number of inmates presenting to the clinics with back strain and muscle injuries following using gymnasium equipment or playing sport in the oval”. As well, there is an acknowledgement that “the position of Activity Officer offers an opportunity to provide high level recreation and fitness programs to inmates and so assist centres in managing inmates.”

At the time of this report, the recommendations from the Working Party which focused on the design of a State-wide Activity Officer’s position description, the need for operational agreements which ensure consistent availability of activity officers and the formal inclusion of activity officers in the correctional centres’ Inmate Services and Programs teams. The Working Party was also pointing to the need to develop gender-specific activities program design and implementation.

**MSPC - 7 Wing**

When staff at 7 Wing in the MSPC’s Area 4 were consulted for this report, it emerged that apart from staff shortages which can prevent inmates from participating in the normal inmate services and programs because access to the program area cannot be facilitated, the lack of consistent access to physical activities is also blamed for high levels of frustration and violence in the remand inmate population. In reality, activities in this area seem to happen only about twice a week. There is no access to industries either. Custodial and non-custodial staff are unanimous in their assessment of the situation. “The inmates here have nothing to do” which staff also agree leads to complaints and frustration and breeds anger and violence.

As 7 Wing was intended to be used for housing remand inmates only as an interim solution, staff commented on the general lack of resources and space. The list of impediments to effective inmate management is long; for example, “internal inmate movements” generally are notoriously difficult here because of staff shortages and the IDS area in ‘Styx’ tends to be the first area from where custodial posts are taken. That means inmates cannot be taken there and there is not a suitable interview room in the wing itself.

---

94 Background paper from CHS to the Working Party reviewing ‘the provision of recreation and activities programs’, AEVTI, August 2001
The Deputy Governor responsible for this wing disagreed with the above statements because “we make sure that inmates see IDS staff”.

Inmates at 7 Wing are mainly transferred from the MRRC but some are also moved from 17 Wing where they may have been in breach of the rules of the specific therapeutic AOD program there. According to some staff, inmates who are accommodated in this wing for court appearances might stay here for six to nine months and their property might still be at the correctional centre from which they were referred for the duration of their court appearance and they may have left jobs behind (CSI positions) and find themselves without the income they had before.

"The biggest frustration here for inmates is phone access ... there is no work so there is no money; also it can take quite a while for their money to come through from other gaols."

ISP staff member MSPC

At the time of this report, there were no Aboriginal inmates in 7 Wing. This seemed to be related to a particular nasty incident a couple of months prior when four Kooris were “jumped on”. The Deputy Governor said that it was not a policy to exclude Kooris from this wing but that Aboriginal inmates are adamant that they do not want to go there.

One of the more concerning comments - not only at this centre but across the consultation spectrum - were the observations by ISP staff that their access to inmates or inmate access to specific program areas was very much dependent on the motivation and co-operation of individual custodial officers. The remark by an ISP staff member that “if there is a good officer on shift, things go smoothly but it shouldn’t be part of my job to ‘suck up’ to them to get inmates from A to B” was fairly typical.
Case Study - Inmate at 7 Wing

Brett has been at 7 wing (Area 4 of the MSPC) for about nine months. "When I came here they said it was for a month." He recently became a 'sweeper' but before that he "spent eight months in the yard with nothing to do".

He says that let-go is at 8:30am and then "you wait in the yard until they lock you in at lunch time" which is at 11:45 am. The next let-go is at 1pm ("It's never really later than 1.30") and "you go to the yard again until half past three".

Brett says "with so many young blokes in the yard, it's always only a question of time before something blows". But "if you try to talk sense into them you have to be careful because you can get on their shit list ...".

"In here they say, you're not allowed to work because you're on remand but that's absolute crap because in other remand centres you can work".

As far as Activities is concerned, Brett has to stop and go over the last few weeks in his head: "I think we get it once or twice a week for an hour." "Sometimes you can go to the library - someone comes to the yard at about 10 in the morning twice a week, I think, and they can take about 10 blokes at a time." "As a sweeper it's much better; you give out the milk and the breakfast and then you clean up and you can stay in the wing if you want to and generally make sure that everything is tidy."

He says he "really feels sorry for the blokes who haven't got any money. They have to get used to long breaks between meals. Breakfast is at sevenish and then lunch is not until 12 o'clock. You have to eat your hot meal at 3.30 in the afternoon and it's a long time with nothing in between until 7 in the morning again - it's hard for young fellas".

"Blokes who don't have any money get $11.50 per week which goes straight on to a small pack of tobacco and that has to last them a week." "Then they borrow and that can cause trouble down the track."
5.5 Specific Issues for the Probation and Parole Service

As there are no established mechanisms for the collection and collation of data regarding incidence of violence against Probation and Parole Officers, there can be no real understanding of the extent of the issue.

In the consultations, Probation and Parole staff pointed to what they perceived was a lack of recognition by management of the level of aggression and violence they have to deal with in their work. At the same time, many viewed having to deal with these situations as “part of the job”. A majority (25 out of the 28 interviewed) said that they had been in a situation where a client had become aggressive and/or violent. Some senior officers of the Probation and Parole Service expressed the view that Probation and Parole Officers should have skills which enable them to cope with difficult clients. It is of concern that Probation and Parole Service staff may not be able to deal with situations effectively when their skills are not adequate to prevent an aggressive or violent act against themselves or against other people in their presence.

There is no standardised response to critical incidents within the Probation and Parole Service. Many officers stated that they found support from their peers when critical incidents occurred but this should not replace a professional supported response.

The majority of officers consulted for this report said they had received no training in using strategic communication, for example, for working with difficult clients. Staff who said they had participated in training of this nature had received it while working for a previous employer. Whilst it is recognised that most Probation and Parole Officers possess the skills required, and indeed use these skills often, there remains a need for specific staff training and development programs. There are already changes to the Primary Training underway. Recently recruited officers now attend training at the Academy which includes a module that takes the demand for these specific communication skills into account and also responds to the requests from staff for self-defence training.

Specific mention should be given to the clerical staff in Probation and Parole offices. As the first point of contact for clients, it is often the clerical officers who bear the brunt of client frustration and anger. The situation might be compounded when the supervising Probation and Parole Officer is delayed and the client must be kept waiting. Recognition of the stressors peculiar to this role is required, with measures taken to ensure the relevant staff receive the necessary level of support and training.
Recommendations
6 Recommendations

6.1 Integrated Violence Prevention Approach

To facilitate an integrated corporate approach to violence prevention and reduction, the development of an overarching policy document is essential. It will provide the impetus to measure the extent of the problem and highlight those areas which need modification.

The underpinning concept of this policy should be based on a conflict resolution model which fosters effective communication. This would not only reinforce the safety of offenders in the care of the Department but also provide improved opportunities for correctional centre inmates in particular to apply and put into practice the new skills they have learnt in a range of cognitive behavioural programs the Department provides.

A policy as suggested will also further enhance all current Departmental initiatives with regard to throughcare and sustain effective communication between, and co-operation of, all sections of the Department particularly between its two major divisions - custodial services and community supervision services.

The policy should acknowledge the specific effects of the physical environments and incarceration itself as contributing, and in some instances causal, factors to violent and aggressive behaviour. The elements which contribute to the concept of a "healthy prison" should be explicitly incorporated into this policy.

An expressed commitment to violence prevention and reduction at a corporate level of the Department will provide a clear signal to all staff and those under the supervision and care of the Department that changes are expected to occur and that the necessary resources be available. It will require the co-operation of custodial and non-custodial staff including the relevant industrial organisations.

1. Development of a policy will help to create and/or improve the corporate ambience and culture in which the key elements of a strategic approach to violence reduction can be enhanced and implemented:

- violence and aggressive behaviour will not be tolerated
- gender analysis of issues surrounding violence will be documented and acknowledged

---

95 Although listed in separate topic categories, the recommendations are numbered sequentially for easy reference.
Talking up Communications - Talking down Violence

- opportunities for violence will be reduced
- those experiencing victimisation will be supported
- core program interventions dealing with violence, anger and aggression will be implemented

6.2 Training, Recruitment and Professional Development

One of the common themes emerging in the consultations for this report was the need for the development of new approaches to training and professional development and / or the expansion of training programs already available to Departmental staff.

Staff training and development in this context is about recognising difficult situations, about being able to read signs of risk and about developing protective behaviour and problem solving via effective communication.

Training and development must take into account that staff have to come to terms with issues surrounding violence on two levels - deal with violence and aggressive behaviour as it occurs and work with violent offenders to encourage long-term behavioural change.

The need for these skills and competencies in all staff who are directly involved in offender management has implications for the Department's recruiting requirements as well.

In particular, it is recommended that

2 the Primary Training for both custodial officers and Probation and Parole staff is reviewed with a view to include specific modules on strategic communication and conflict resolution. Such training should also be considered for non-custodial correctional centre staff such as administrative and ISP personnel;

3 existing training modules ie, the HRMU training and VPP are integrated and available to custodial staff other than those employed in the specialised areas of high risk management and therapeutic programs;

4 in the recruitment of staff a focus is placed on skills and competencies related to communication / strategic communication

---

66 This included a training component (SMART) which was devised by the education and training officer at Goulburn Correctional Centre and focused specifically on conflict resolution skills.
6.3 Offender Management and Structured Day - Access to Programs, Services and Activities

With few exceptions, everybody consulted for this report, especially staff employed in correctional centres stressed the importance of engaging inmates in meaningful activities and of creating clear and realistic program pathways for them. This was not seen to be at the expense of the provision of programs proven to be effective in reducing recidivism.

Similarly, for offenders under the supervision of the Probation and Parole Service, it was considered crucial that expectations of their co-operation and behaviour was clearly articulated and that the specific local community resources be integral to the operations of any district office.

Both in the custodial and in the community setting, all staff consulted agreed that the effective provision of programs and services hinges on correct screening and assessment processes and effective case management to facilitate throughcare.

In particular it is recommended that

5 in the negotiations concerning operational agreements, the role of non-custodial staff be clearly delineated, keeping in mind that the delivery of programs and services is an integral part of correctional centre security imperatives;

6 access to activities be considered crucial for all inmates and be regarded as a violence reduction strategy and not as part of a set of privileges;

7 a yearly one day conference for all activities officers be established to give increased relevance to their work in the context of effective inmate management and to ensure improved information exchange between the centres with a view to develop best practice standards for this area;

8 the viability of formalised links between case management (specifically screening/assessment processes) and intel data systems be explored;

9 the feasibility of the introduction of violence-free wings be explored akin to the established drug-free wings within correctional centres;

---

97 The recommendations regarding the role of activities officers should be read in conjunction with Recommendations: From the Working Committee Reviewing the Provision of Recreation and Activities Programs, Falcioni, M. 2002.
the minimum standards developed for the Junee tendering process\(^\text{98}\) with regard to effective grievance/complaints mechanisms for inmates being applied to all correctional centres

a relevant and effective grievance/complaints mechanisms for offenders under community supervision be established for the Probation and Parole Service

### 6.4 Program Development and Evaluation

The introduction of effectiveness-based programming derived from the ‘What Works Literature’ and the introduction of specified core programming modules together with the proposed restructure of the Inmate Services and Programs area will create opportunities for the implementation of targeted programs for offenders who present a medium to high risk of violence.

The recommendations of the Inmate Services and Programs Review\(^\text{99}\) with regard to program integrity and the pivotal role of program evaluation are reinforced by this report.

In particular, it is recommended that

12. correctional centre-based Probation and Parole Officers, Activities Officers and CSI representatives be an integral part of the inmate services and program planning team;

13. all Inmate Services and Program Plans (ISPPs) include particular references to violence and violence reduction;

14. performance indicators for programs dealing with the development of social skills, anger management and violence prevention are linked to the incidence of violence and aggression in those correctional centres where these programs are provided;

15. the Program Development Unit proposed by the ISP Review place a major emphasis on the design of core program modules dealing with problem solving and conflict resolution;

---

\(^{98}\) 009/7106: Tender for the Operation and the Management of Junee Correctional Centre, p S-19

\(^{99}\) NSW Department of Corrective Services, Review of Inmate Services and Programs, Supervisory and Service Delivery Structures, February 2001. Please note that at the time of this report, the recommendations of this review had not been signed off.
in the development of anger management and/or violence prevention programs, the specific needs of female offenders are explored and defined.

6.5 Staff Roles and Attitudes

If there is one universally identified theme emerging from the consultations for this report, it is that the 'cultural divide' between custodial and non-custodial officers, between staff of the Department and employees of the Corrections Health Service and between centre-based staff and Probation and Parole Officers in the community is far from being bridged. It is this statement of fact which is also universally bemoaned. There appears to be general agreement too, that such fragmentation leads to ad hoc program and services planning which in turn is detrimental to the spirit of throughcare.

This is not to deny that there are differences, for example, in the role of staff in a custodial setting on the one hand and in a community setting on the other. Probation and Parole Officers in the community like staff in correctional centres deal with offenders with similar criminal histories and criminogenic needs. There is however, a type of violence and aggression that might be purely the result of incarceration which officers in a community setting do not have to deal with.

Everybody consulted agreed that the effectiveness of case management is prefaced on the professional cooperation of staff across the various disciplines. But custodial officers in particular expressed some uncertainty about their exact role in the case management process.

In correctional centres, specific posts stipulated in the operational agreements and allocated to custodial officers require them to carry out specific and defined tasks. What are less clearly delineated are the more undefined functions which are to be fulfilled by custodial staff as part of dynamic security and which depend on officers' initiative, motivation and communication skills.

In particular, it is recommended that

17 violence response teams which are experienced in conflict resolution be established; akin to the RAJT scheme, these violence response teams are to carry out on the spot assessments when and where an incident occurs and devise appropriate responses;

18 the role of case officers be reviewed acknowledging that they can fulfil their role in dynamic security more effectively if they are provided with increased opportunities that allow them to know their case load better;
the possibility be explored of linking the quality of staff - inmate interaction to performance criteria of Area Managers/Unit Managers;

specific guidelines and protocols for the intensive case management for inmates at risk of being violent be established;

to enhance a ‘cultural shift’ the current staff awards system be examined with a view to include commendations for staff who deal with difficult and challenging situations by using strategic communication strategies;

‘dealing with difficult clients’ becomes a standing agenda item in unit meetings in Probation and Parole offices;

non-custodial correctional centre staff and Probation and Parole Officers be included formally in Corrections Intelligence Group (CIG) and State Investigative and Security Group (SISG) functions.

6.6 Further Research and Reporting Focus

The consultations and explorations for this report highlighted several areas where further research seems warranted. This is particularly true for program development which require sensitivity to cultural and gender issues.

The consultations also revealed that the Department’s reporting processes are well understood and followed by staff on the ground.

In particular, it is recommended that

a broader focus in emphasis in the reporting of incidents be explored with a view to shift from documentation of an event to investigation to help ensure that preventative measures can be applied;

the effectiveness of community visiting schemes (eg Aboriginal elders) in violence reduction strategies be examined, evaluated and documented;

a risk assessment report into the work of correctional officers and ISP staff similar to the one provided for Probation and Parole office staff be commissioned;

a research project (akin to the alcohol and violence project) be included in the program of the Research and Statistics Unit to analyse the link between gambling and violence, and gambling and drugs and violence;
critical incident reporting with regard to the work of Probation and Parole Officers be included in the Department's overall statistical data collection;

the current reporting with regard to lock-ins be audited to achieve greater accuracy of actual out-of-cell hours;

within the parameters of the recommendations of the Women's Action Plan 2, the suggested research schedule be amended to include specific projects dealing with women as perpetrators of violence and programming effective in dealing with their particular needs.

6.7 Pilot Projects

The recommendations in this report accentuate issues relating to one aspect in particular - management patterns and operational approaches with regard to inmates acting violently and aggressively as a result of frustration with regard to delayed access to services, programs and activities, overcrowding and other difficult environmental conditions.

Even though there is statistical evidence showing that violence and aggression between inmates is on an ascending curve, the Department's initiatives are making a positive impact in those locations identified as 'violence hot spots'. This is particularly worth noting since a significant number of those in the care and under supervision of the Department tend to have a history of violent crime and poor impulse control.

It is impossible to devise further effective strategies to deal with violence and aggression which are the result of either of incarceration itself or of frustration with 'the system' without examining established work practices and staff competencies.

To give the recommendations of this report practical application and a base from which appropriate program design and evaluation are possible, four pilot projects at designated work places exemplifying the broad range of the Department's functions are suggested below.  

To ensure relevance and appropriateness of all the proposed pilot projects, the authors of this report sought the opinions of a group of Departmental staff in an one-off workshop which brought together the Superintendent Therapeutic Programs, an Activities Officer, two AEVTI representatives, one Correctional Centre based welfare officer, one Manager District Office Probation and Parole and the author of the report "Gangs in the NSW Correctional System - Clarifying the Assertion".
6.7.1 Community Liaison Officer - Probation and Parole Service

It has been pointed out by Probation and Parole staff in the course of the consultations for this report that there might at times be added cultural and community pressures on staff who are of the same non-English language background as their clients and who are not only working but also living in the same cultural community as some of their clients. These added pressures may impede the effective supervision of particular offenders and also may inadvertently increase the work load of officers who are connected to particular ethnic and/or language communities because their expertise and language skills may be sought beyond the management of their own case load.

The Bankstown Probation and Parole Office, for example, is dealing with an increasing number of offenders of Lebanese and other Arabic-speaking backgrounds. It is proposed that a pilot program be established at the Bankstown Probation and Parole Office to ascertain the validity of the following objectives:

- to ensure the successful participation and attendance rates of offenders of Arabic-speaking backgrounds under the supervision of the Bankstown Probation and Parole Office and

- to ensure the most appropriate and effective use of local culturally relevant community resources in the supervision of offenders of Arabic-speaking backgrounds

To this end, an Arabic speaking community liaison officer be employed part-time for an initial period of 12 months who has detailed and practical knowledge of issues facing the local Arabic speaking communities.

The option of co-managing/sponsoring the pilot in partnership with a local community agency (eg Bankstown Neighbourhood Centre) or another Government Department (eg Community Relations Commission) or the Arabic Communities Council should be explored.

It is expected that the community liaison officer brings to the project a good rapport with Lebanese community representatives, is Arabic speaking, has networking skills and is able to identify professionals/community workers who can deliver/facilitate programs relevant to offenders reporting to Bankstown Office. In addition, this officer must have an understanding of Probation and Parole services and programs and must be able to work effectively with all local Arabic speaking communities.
In planning this pilot, a review/evaluation process should be designed and the review team should include the Manager, Probation and Parole Bankstown, the sponsoring community agency/Government Department, the Department's proposed Program Evaluation Unit and/or the Corporate Planning and Development Unit, an expert external to the Department (e.g., university) and the local Community Drug Action Team (CDAT).

The performance indicators for the pilot should include, among other things, the number of offenders in whose case management the community liaison officer has been involved, the number of call-outs for the position and increased use of culturally appropriate community resources.

The project outcomes could have benefits beyond the Bankstown Probation and Parole Office and Probation and Parole offices in general. The pilot project can be designed in such a manner that it leads to the establishment best practice standards for effective community supervision with clients from non-English speaking backgrounds and can produce a training module for community liaison officers.

6.7.2 Conflict Resolution Training

This report has identified the need for violence prevention/reduction strategies within a conflict resolution structure as a matter of priority. In order to be able to ascertain the validity of such an approach in a custodial setting, it is proposed to establish a pilot project in a designated correctional centre with a relatively high incidence of violence and aggression between inmates. The objectives of this pilot are to ensure a safe environment for both staff and inmates and to facilitate effective case management and increased access to activities, programs, services and work opportunities.

Within a time frame of three months all custodial staff, identified ISP staff and selected inmates at this designated correctional centre are trained in conflict resolution techniques. After the completion of the training program, six months should be considered the implementation phase followed by a formal evaluation process linked to performance indicators such as reduction of assault rates / incidents in the centre.

Within the framework of the proposed corporate violence reduction / prevention policy, this pilot could lead to determining best practice standards for violence reduction / prevention in correctional centres and competency based modules of accredited conflict resolution skills.
This pilot project requires the effective co-operation between the Regional Commander in whose Region the designated correctional centre is located, the Statewide Clinical Co-ordinator of the Violence Prevention Program and the Corrective Services Academy. In addition, the expertise of The Conflict Resolution Network should be sought and appropriately budgeted.

6.7.3 Violence Prevention Program for Women

In the consultations for this report, the Governor of Mulawa Correctional Centre highlighted the need for specialist services and resources for women who present management difficulties due to their intimidatory and/or violent behaviour. Initial exploration of the feasibility of a satellite module for women of the Long Bay Violence Prevention Program is already underway in a co-operative effort between the Statewide Clinical Co-ordinator for Violence Prevention Programs and the Governor of Mulawa.

This report supports the establishment of such a pilot scheme at the Berrima Correctional Centre and suggests the involvement of the Women’s Services Unit (WSU) in the design and evaluation the pilot project. The rationale for the project is based on perceptions and anecdotal evidence of an increasing number of violent women as well as on the statistically documented relatively high rate of assaults at Mulawa Correctional Centre. The WSU can contribute to ensuring that in the project development stage for this pilot these perceptions and statistics are examined particularly in light of the acute mental health issues women in custody are facing.

An evaluation should be carried out as a joint venture which includes the research officer connected to the Long Bay Violence Prevention Program, a representative of the Women’s Services Unit and members of Berrima Correctional Centre staff.

It is proposed that the implementation phase of this pilot project will last for an initial period of six months and depending on the outcome of an evaluation be further developed under the direction of the recently established Commander Women’s Facilities.

Performance indicators should include a reduction in the number and severity of violent incidents between women inmates, the number of women completing the program and their effective participation in the range of programs provided at the Berrima Correctional Centre. It is also vital that the program module at Berrima is formally linked to any programs participants may undertake once released to the community supervision part of their sentence.
A significant outcome of this pilot project would be the determination of best practice standards for effective violence reduction/prevention programs for women offenders. A training module for staff working with violent women offenders could also be developed.

6.7.4 Transitional Centre for Men

In the context of current throughcare initiatives, the establishment of a transitional centre for men (akin to the Parramatta Transitional Centre for women) has been mooted frequently. A recommendation in the report into Security Threat Groups\textsuperscript{101} specifically deals with the need for a transitional centre for men acknowledging the importance of community based programs and resources in the “practical re-integration [of inmates] back into the community”.

The importance of a residential program for men specifically designed to meet their needs in a transition period from full-time custody to living in the community has been identified in the consultations for this report as well. However, it is suggested that one of the access criteria for the first transitional centre for men should stipulate that all potential residents should have completed all existing modules of the Long Bay Violence Prevention Program.

Such an approach would ensure that inmates who have completed the Long Bay VPP can be placed in a custodial environment in which the practical application of the skills learnt can be achieved. In a community based transitional centre, residents can be better supported to live violence-free and deal effectively with stress factors which might trigger violent behaviour and so leave custody better equipped for life in the community.

The recommendations resulting from the Departmental evaluation of the Parramatta Transitional Centre for women should form the basis in planning this transitional centre for men and in devising an evaluation methodology for the project.

\textsuperscript{101} Goodstone, L., December 2001, p 75
Postscript

Since our report was finalised, we had the opportunity to visit the Berrima Correctional Centre. Since Christmas, this centre now accommodates about 45 female inmates. We talked informally to a few of the women who had been transferred from the Emu Plains Correctional Centre and to a few members of staff. We were struck by the friendly and unagitated ambience of the place.

At this point in time, this correctional centre seems to be an excellent example of a “healthy prison” \(^\text{102}\). All the elements of a “healthy prison” seem to be coming together in a way which allows a correctional centre to function effectively for both staff and inmates. The inmates we talked to gave “programs” and “officers” the big thumbs up. The physical environment is pleasant and there are many opportunities for the women to get busy with programs and vocational activities. The Acting Deputy on the day of the visit pointed out that she had never worked in a gaol were urinalysis was so “easy”: “They don’t mind being urined here because they are confident that they’ll get a clean result”.

All staff working at the centre were provided with the opportunity to participate in a comprehensive staff development program before the women inmates arrived. This program covered the most critical areas of offender management with regard to the specific needs of women in custody. The results speak for themselves.

\(^{102}\) See section 3.2.2
| **activities** | This is the term used to describe inmates' access to leisure-type pursuits such as working out with gym equipment or playing team sports. |
| **buy-ups** | Once a week, inmates are issued with personal items they have ordered and paid for. These may include tobacco, greetings cards and snacks. |
| **intel** | This is short hand for ‘Intelligence’ which in turn is the collective term to describe the operations of the Security and Investigations section of the Department. |
| **let-go** | This is the time in the morning when custodial officers unlock the inmates’ cells. |
| **lock-in** | This describes the time in the afternoon when custodial officers lock the inmates in their cells. |
| **lock-down** | This describes the situation when inmates are locked in a particular section or all inmates of a particular correctional centre are locked in their cells. Apart from during the night, lock-downs can occur for several reasons, e.g., during staff meetings or when an incident occurs which may have security and safety implications. When inmates are confined to their wing rather than their cells, this can also be referred to as a lock-down. |
stripping posts

In a correctional centre, custodial duties are allocated according to 'posts' stipulated in the centre's Operational Agreement. For example, gate duties or activities or clinic supervision are categorised as posts. When staff shortages occur due to illness, for example, certain posts might be deemed more important than others and some posts might not be filled on a particular day. Officers initially allocated to these posts might get moved ('stripped') to fulfil the duties of a post with higher priority in the effective running of a correctional centre.

sweeper

This is a relatively old but still used term to identify inmates who work as cleaners or in clerical support roles in their wings or centre and industries administration.

tipped

This describes a situation in which an inmates is transferred to another correctional centre as a result of a serious misconduct or security breach. This might include a review of his/her security classification and the loss of certain privileges.

ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACIM</td>
<td>Assistant Commissioner, Inmate Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPP</td>
<td>Assistant Commissioner, Probation and Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Correctional Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>Corrections Health Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH</td>
<td>Long Bay Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMTC</td>
<td>Metropolitan Medical Transit Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSPC</td>
<td>Malabar Special Programs Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRC</td>
<td>Ministerial Reference Committee on Violence Prevention in the Correctional System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRRC</td>
<td>Metropolitan Reception and Remand Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACICS</td>
<td>Senior Assistant Commissioner Inmate and Custodial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS</td>
<td>Inmate Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP</td>
<td>Inmate Services and Programs (replacing the term IDS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>